DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 486 PS 009 722

TITLE Demonstration Project for the Registration of Family Day Care Homes. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Dept. of Social Services, Lansing.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 1 May 77
GRANT OCD-CB-510
NOTE 133p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal quality of print in parts of document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Certification; *Child Care; Data Collection; *Day Care Services; *Demonstration Programs; *Family Day Care; *State Legislation; State Licensing Boards; State Standards; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Day Care Licensing; Michigan

ABSTRACT

This report describes a two-year State of Michigan demonstration project designed to investigate the feasibility of regulating family day care homes through a registration process that would be more effective and economical than the present licensing system. Registration is defined as the process whereby the State Department of Social Services maintains a record of family day care homes, requiring the provider to self-certify substantial compliance with state regulations. Four primary hypotheses tested were that registration counties in contrast to licensing counties, would have: (1) a greater percentage of increase in the number of children receiving care; (2) an equal or lower percentage of regulated homes with rule violations; (3) equal or lower expenditures of funds per home regulated; and (4) providers who were more willing to be regulated. The project sample consisted of six Virginia counties with 5,600 children in 1,900 family day care homes. Two experimental groups (of 2 counties each) used, in one case, registration with training and public information components and, in the other, licensing with the same components; a control group of two counties used current licensing practices. The report describes project development, methods, findings and recommendations. Findings indicate that the registration process: (1) is perceived by providers as easier, (2) is less expensive, and (3) can regulate more homes than the licensing process, but (4) does not provide as much compliance with rules as does licensing. (BF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148486

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR THE REGISTRATION OF FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES
(Final Report)

Bureau of Regulatory Services
State of Michigan
Department of Social Services

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jeralyn Harrold

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

DSS Publication - 289
May 1, 1977

PS 009722

FOREWORD

The need to regulate facilities and homes in which children are placed for out-of-home day care has been well documented and responded to in the form of licensing laws and regulatory programs throughout the nation.

These programs have developed in response to an accelerated use of day care by American parents.

Mary Keyserling in her widely acclaimed book entitled Windows on Day Care, states, "About one-third of all mothers with children under the age of six, totaling 4 1/2 million women, are in the labor force." In her book, she also states that well under 10% of these children are enrolled in day care centers. "The large majority are cared for in their own homes or the homes of others..."

While the need for regulating family day care homes is generally accepted, it has not been clear as to what is the most appropriate method to be employed. The use of licensing as traditionally understood seems to regulate only a small proportion of the number of family day care homes actually in operation.

As a result of this question and concern, the Michigan Legislature authorized the Department of Social Services to conduct "a 2 year demonstration project of registration of family day care homes..." (Act 116, P.A. of 1973, Section 9).

The project undertaken by the Department essentially focused on the impact of registration as a regulatory approach as contrasted to licensing. The demonstration project attempted to put into operation the theoretical concepts of registration. While the project cannot be considered as being comprehensive in its scope, I do believe it provides a pilot study of a hitherto unexplored area. The results of this project will have implications for policy and practice as it relates to the regulation of family day care homes.

Acknowledgments are due to a great number of individuals without whom the project could not have been accomplished. The project was, in part, sponsored by a grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Grant No. OCD-CB-510). The project was directed by Jeralyn Harrold. Jacqueline Wood provided much of the day-to-day management of the project, and Reginald Carter guided the research aspect of the project and supervised the data collection and data evaluation. All three of these individuals were responsible for putting together the material and writing the report.

Recognition is also due to the members of the Advisory Committee whose counsel and guidance was most appreciated, particularly during the project's developmental phase. Those who served as members of this committee are:

Susan Brook, Executive Coordinator, Michigan Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) Council; Helen B. Burton, Michigan Department of Social Services; Harold S. Gazan, Acting Director, Bureau of Regulatory Services, Michigan Department of Social Services; Marilyn Hall, Executive Coordinator for Experimental and Demonstration Projects, Michigan Department of Social Services; Gerald G. Hicks, Director, Office of Children and Youth Services, Michigan Department of Social Services; Edna Hughes, U.S. Department of

Health, Education, and Welfare; Mildred Wilson, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Joseph Winer, Michigan Department of Social Services.

In addition, Lela B. Costin, Professor of Social Work, Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work, University of Illinois, served as a special consultant to the project.

I wish to also acknowledge the cooperation and efforts of the county administrators and staff of the 6 sample counties. Their commitment to the extra assignments enabled this project to succeed.

John T. Dempsey, Director
Michigan Department of Social Services

May 1, 1977

PROJECT SUMMARY

Background

During this decade, states throughout the nation have been examining the most appropriate method with which family day care homes can be best regulated. Licensing has been traditionally the common method. However, registration of family day care homes has been proposed as a possible viable alternative to licensing by child care regulatory experts such as Norris Class, Edna Hughes and Gwen Morgan.

In 1973, the Michigan Legislature authorized the Department of Social Services to conduct a demonstration project of the registration of family day care homes. The authorization is outlined in Section 9 of Act No. 116 of the Public Acts 1973.

The Project was planned during 1974 and implemented in July, 1975. During that time, the Department was collecting pre-data from the Project counties. Between July, 1975 and January, 1976, Project data was collected. In February, 1976, the Department of Social Services submitted its preliminary findings on the Project to the legislature in a report entitled, "Demonstration Project of the Registration of Family Day Care Homes, Interim Report", DSS Publication-289, February 12, 1976. The Project has continued and additional data has been secured. This paper is the final report of the Project findings and the Department's recommendations.

Registration

As defined in Act No. 116, P.A. 1976, registration is the process whereby the Department maintains a record of all family day care homes and requires the person operating a home to certify that he or she complies and will continue to comply with the rules. The family day care home provider self-certifies substantial compliance at the time of registration. After registration, the person will have available to him or her, consultative resources for interpretative and educational information regarding child care.

The actual number of family day care homes operating in Michigan is unknown. The estimate by national experts indicates that approximately 10% to 15% of the family day care homes currently operating are licensed. It is known that, in Michigan, the total number of homes licensed is approximately 9,800 and that the number of homes regulated in the two registration counties, Kalamazoo and Midland, increased dramatically during the period of the Project.

Project Design

The purpose of the Registration Project was to study registration as possibly a more appropriate type of regulatory method than is licensing from the operational viewpoint of effectiveness, efficiency, and economy. The primary hypotheses to be tested are:

H.1. Registration counties will have a higher percent of increase in the number of children receiving care in regulated family day care homes than the licensing counties.

H.2. Registration counties will have the same or a lower percent of regulated homes having rule violations than the licensing counties.

H.3. Registration counties will have the same or a lower exposure of funds per home regulated than the licensing counties.

H.4. Providers in registration counties will be more willing to become regulated than the providers in licensing counties.

Planning for the Project began in the winter of 1974 with the delegation of staff and the selection of an Advisory Committee. A sample was selected consisting of six Michigan counties, four experimental counties and two control counties matched by demographic characteristics. Approximately 1,900 family day care homes, licensed or registered to care for 6,500 children, were included in the six-county sample.

The six sample counties were divided into three groups. Each group was composed of two counties. Two groups served as experimental counties and one group served as the control counties. Each group conducted one of the following regulatory approaches:

Experimental Group I (Kalamazoo and Midland) - Registration including the two components of training and public information.

Experimental Group II (Washtenaw and Marquette) - Licensing with training and public information components identical to those of registration.

Control Group (Ingham and Shiawassee) - Licensing as currently practiced in Michigan.

The Project was implemented on July 1, 1975. Between July 1, 1974 and July 1, 1975, one year of pre-data was collected, thus giving a base line of county regulatory activity in the Project counties prior to implementation of registration. Pre-data was collected on a quarterly basis. Project data, also collected quarterly has been gathered for eighteen (18) months.

Descriptive data were gathered on each county's regulatory activities through forms and questionnaires sent to regulatory workers and family day care home providers. Data collection focused on the number of homes regulated; provider attitudes; inquiries about family day care; complaints related to family day care homes; rule violations; number of children in care; cost per regulated home; and demographic information. Following the collection of data, a comparison of means between the experimental and control groups was used as the basis for the analysis.

Findings and Recommendations

The Interim Report, dated February 12, 1976, drew only tentative conclusions. At that time, the tentative conclusions were based on two months of Project data compared to a year of pre-data. The preliminary findings suggested that the registration process results in a higher number of homes regulated than does licensing and that providers show a greater willingness to become registered. The findings also showed that registration had incurred moderate costs (e.g. higher than the control groups costs but lower than the enriched licensing group) because of public information and newsletter mailings to providers. A preliminary negative finding of registration was that the percentage of registered homes in violation of one or more administrative rules is greater than the percentage of licensed homes in violation.

The continuation of the Project for an additional year has enabled the Department to gather additional comparative data and to examine the consequences of utilizing the registration process. A summary of the conclusions drawn from the Project, based on one year of pre-data and one and a quarter years of post data, follows:

The results of this demonstration project indicate that the registration process of regulating family day care homes (1) is perceived by providers as easier, (2) is less expensive, and (3) does regulate more homes than the present licensing process. However, it does not provide as much compliance as licensing. The rules being violated by most homes under the registration process are confined to only a few (i.e., TB tests, medical statements). In the licensed homes, the rules being violated included TB statements, home maintenance, sanitation, outdoor play area and record keeping. If the registration process could be modified to insure compliance to these rules, considerable savings per home regulated could be realized.

Based on the Project's findings and after careful consideration of those findings and their consequences, the Department recommends to the legislature the following:

1. The process of registration be utilized statewide as the method by which family day care homes are to be regulated.

2. The statute, Act No. 116 of the Public Acts of 1973, be changed to reflect this regulatory process with appropriate provisions for a pre-issuance investigation procedure if deemed necessary, a denial procedure, a revocation procedure and an adequate level of supervision.

3. The Department administer the registration process in such a manner so as to reduce the rate of rule violations as found in this Project's registered homes. It is suggested that this can be done by:

   a. Requiring an applicant to submit proof of freedom from communicable TB before registration;
   b. Stressing the importance of rules and the interpretation of rules at the time of registration;
   c. Providing an adequate number of staff so the number of homes that are spot-checked can be increased (i.e., a stronger emphasis on regulatory supervision);
   d. Maintaining a percentage of 10% spot checks per month.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

	Page
1. Historic Development of Day Care and Day Care Regulation	1
2. Registration and Its Significance..............................	5
3. Project Development....................................	8
A. Initial Planning....................................	8
B. Information and Training Components..................	10
C. Overview of the Registration Process..................	13
D. County Selection....................................	15
E. Planning Difficulties..................................	20
F. Operational Difficulties..............................	21
4. Methods..	24
5. Findings..	27
6. Conclusions..	35
7. Recommendations..	38
8. List of Tables..	39

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Project Staff....................................	71
Appendix B - The Caregiver....................................	73
Appendix C - Media Pamphlet..................................	76
Appendix D - Data Tools......................................	79
Appendix E - Provider Questionnaire..........................	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY..	102

Chapter 1. HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT OF DAY CARE AND DAY CARE REGULATION

The group care of children for part of a day began over a century ago when the first day care center in America was established in New York City in 1854.[1] This center and other early established day care centers were founded to care for children of poor working mothers, to prevent child neglect and to deter the need for institutionalization. The care given was basically physical care with children fed and protected from only "obvious" hazards. This substandard child care went generally unnoticed by the public. However, during the latter part of the 19th Century, there was an increased awareness of and demand for state regulation and inspection of 24-hour care foster homes and orphanages. During the first half of the Twentieth Century, as a result of the World Wars and the Depression, the number of working women increased and the number of day care facilities multiplied. By 1937, 37 states had passed licensing laws.[2]

In Michigan, the first legislation relating to regulatory activities of child caring facilities was Act 41 of P.A. 1899. This Act required any incorporated society, association and organization receiving and maintaining minor children in institutions or placing minor children in homes to keep records and to make certain reports. It also permitted the state to make "official inspection". (Act 42 of 1899 prohibited non-incorporated societies, associations, organizations or persons from receiving, maintaining or placing minor children in homes.)[3]

---

[1] Norris Class, "Public Policy and Working Mothers: A Historical Analysis of the American Experience," Annual Lecture on Public Policy Issues, p. 1.

[2] Lela B. Costin, Child Welfare: Policies and Practice, p. 305.

[3] Michigan Public Acts, 1899, No. 41 and No. 42, p. 61-621.

Although Act 41 permitted state inspection by the State Board of Corrections and Charities, it was not until 1913 when Act 300 (P.A. 1913) was passed that Michigan had its first licensing law.[4] The introduction to Act 300 states that it is:

> "An Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of persons, societies, organizations, associations or corporations engaged in the business of receiving, maintaining or placing out minor children and prescribing the duties and compensation of county agents."

The Act required an investigation of the methods of doing business, the applicant's character and fitness to provide for care and have custody of children and to operate a facility. Rules and regulations were to be developed and prescribed. A penalty for violation of the Act was set; the penalty was similar to the penalty in the current child care licensing law.

Six years later, in 1919, the legislature passed Act 136 which provided for the licensing and regulation of boarding homes. In this Act, a boarding home was defined as a person who has in his custody or control for a period longer than 30 days, one (1) or more children under 15 years unrelated to him by blood or marriage for the purpose of providing care, food and lodging. Rules and regulations were established and state inspection to determine "suitableness of the home" was mandated.[5]

Act 47 of P.A. 1944 continued the regulation of child placing agencies, child caring institutions and foster homes. This Act expanded the licensing and regulation responsibility to include day care centers, children's camps, homes for unmarried mothers and homes caring for children for less than 24 hours per day (known as part time foster home). This licensing law also contained greater specificity regarding the licensing process.[6]

---

[4] Ibid, 1913, No. 300, p. 573.

[5] Ibid, 1919, No. 136, p. 248.

During the 29 years between Act 47 (P.A. 1947) and the current licensing statute, Act 116 (P.A. 1973), the establishment of day care facilities mushroomed across the nation and in Michigan. The growth of day care has been attributed to three (3) main factors: 1) the entrance of more women in the work force; 2) a new emphasis and interest placed on a child's development during the formative years of his life; and 3) the passage of federal legislation (Head Start, Title I, Title IV) during the 1960's.

Act 116 (P.A. 1973), the current licensing legislation, clearly defines the eight types of child caring organizations and functional aspects of the licensing process. In addition, it contains many innovative aspects such as the authority to provide consultation, the mandate to involve the community in the development of rules, the requirement to inform the public about the law and the need for licensing. The statute also expands the regulatory jurisdiction of the Department of Social Services to include governmental as well as non-governmental child caring organizations, thereby, removing a possible double standard between the two sectors. The demonstration project of the registration of family day care homes is outlined in Section 9 of this Act. The controversy and reasons for the inclusion of the registration project are described in Chapter 2 of this paper.

---

[6] Ibid, 1944, No. 47, p. 89.

In summary, the state inspection of child care facilities in Michigan began in 1899 with state regulation beginning in 1913. Refinement and expansion of the regulation and inspection of child care facilities have evolved to the present legislation, Act 116 (P.A. 1973).

Chapter 2. REGISTRATION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

State agencies responsible for the administration of day care licensing have found that the regulation of day care centers differs considerably from the licensing of family day care homes.[7] Many states have been able to regulate all or nearly all of the day care centers. The centers have been regulated so that children are safeguarded, the public accepts the state's responsibility to assure an acceptable level of care, and the number of staff and expenditure of monies are reasonable.

The experience with family day care home licensing has been different. In a 1970 Day Care Survey done by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Westat Research, Inc., it was reported that a minimum of 987,000 children are cared for in family day care homes with 85% of these children cared for year-round.[8] Gwen Morgan, a national regulatory specialist, estimates that only 5%-10% of the family day care homes in the United States are licensed.[9] Many states are examining how to better regulate the currently licensed homes and how to extend the regulatory process to those homes operating illegally so that children in family day care homes can be safeguarded more appropriately. The states, through this examination process, are seeking ways to improve their regulatory programs so that all family day care homes can be regulated in a fair and equitable manner and so that parents share the responsibility with the state and the provider of protecting their children while these children are in another person's home.

---

[7] Gwen Morgan, Alternatives for Regulation of Family Day Care Homes for Children, p. 1a.

[8] Ibid, p. 1b.

[9] Ibid, p. 1b.

Although there has been no significant research in the area, Gwen Morgan, in her publication, Alternatives for Regulation of Family Day Care Homes for Children, states some possible reasons why family day care homes are not coming forward to be licensed. The first reason is that public information of the need to be licensed has not been significant. Many people do not know about the licensing law or the licensing rules. Secondly, licensing appears to be complicated, expensive and threatening. Persons providing family day care fear for the inspection of their private homes and the questioning of their child rearing and housekeeping practices. There is concern about reporting the minimal day care income to the Internal Revenue Service. The community has observed little or no enforcement of the licensing law and persons wonder why they need to be licensed while others can manage to avoid licensing.[10]

Nationally, the regulatory administration experts have begun discussing an alternative type of regulation for family day care homes known as "registration". In licensing, the applicant must do something in advance of caring for children with the regulatory agency making a determination of conformity to rules. If conformity exists, the agency gives official permission to operate (e.g., a license). In registration, the process to gain the official permission to operate is much less complicated. In Michigan, the registration applicant self-certifies his compliance with rules and is given a Certificate of Registration without prior agency determination of rule conformity.

The enforcement of registration relies heavily on community awareness and involvement. It calls for every parent whose child is in a day care home to be given a copy of the rules and a method for reporting complaints of alleged substandard care. The community is also informed of the need for persons to register, the registration agency's location and the method for reporting concerns or complaints. Registration utilizes the community's involvement to share the enforcement responsibility.

---

[10] Ibid, p. 11-13.

Chapter 3. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

A. Initial Planning

With the Michigan Legislature's passage of Act 116, P.A. 1973, the Department of Social Services commenced the initial planning steps for the implementation of a registration demonstration. Registration was to be studied as possibly a more appropriate type of regulatory process for family day care homes than the currently used licensing method.

One of the beginning planning steps taken by the Department was the delegation of central office staff to develop, implement, and conduct the Project (Appendix A). As a support to the staff, an Advisory Committee to the Registration Project was established with representation from the Michigan 4-C Council, the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Department of Social Services local office staff, Department of Social Services' Children's Services, Regulatory Services, and Planning Unit. Functionally, the committee added breadth to the development and design of the Project by expanding the Project's focus through exploration of alternatives. Input gained from Advisory Committee discussions assisted the Family Day Care Home Regulatory staff to begin implementation of the mandate of Act 116, P.A. 1973.

Another beginning step of implementation was the development of administrative rules for family day care homes. An ad hoc committee was convened in February, 1974, and the promulgation process was begun.

Previously, family day care in Michigan was viewed as part-time foster care; both family day care homes and foster family homes were regulated using the administrative rules for foster homes. Thus, none of the differences between foster care and family day care were addressed through the promulgation of separate administrative rules for each type of care. Awareness of the potential differences which might exist between these two sets of rules led to the decision to implement the Registration Project as soon as newly promulgated family day care rules became effective. It was believed that a conversion to a new set of administrative rules after the beginning of the Project would introduce an additional research variable in the middle of the Project data collection. The potential for confusion caused by this additional variable of the final data analysis was believed to be great enough to warrant holding the Project implementation until the completion of the promulgation process.

Simultaneous with the promulgation process, national experts on regulation were contacted to assist in the development of a conceptual framework for registration in Michigan. At this time, the purpose of the Project was clearly defined as "the study of registration to determine if registration would be a more appropriate type of regulatory system than licensing from the operational viewpoint of effectiveness, efficiency, and economy".

Based on this, three approaches to regulation were to be compared in matched sets of counties. The first approach was to be registration including the components of staff training, mass media information and provider training. The second and third approaches were to use licensing. The difference between these two licensing approaches consisted of one approach being licensing as currently practiced and the other being "enriched" licensing.

The "enrichment" aspects of licensing involved the addition of the identical registration components of staff training, mass media information, and provider information. By including these additional components for the "enriched" approach, a clearer assessment could be made as to the effect of public information and staff training. Without these additions, there was concern as to whether the regulatory process or the training and information components would be responsible for the findings.

B. Information and Training Components

The development and implementation of the information component of registration and enriched licensing involved the following aspects:

1. Establishing a family day care home resource library located at each county Department of Social Services office for use by providers and staff to seek information on child care.
2. Gathering information on safety, nutrition, inexpensive home day care publications and county community resources. This information is included in a provider resource packet. The packet is given to each new registrant or licensee to assist him in providing care and to serve as an incentive in seeking additional child care information.
3. Writing of a bi-monthly family day care home newsletter to be mailed to all regulated family day care homes in the experimental counties. The newsletter's purpose is to share ideas between providers and to communicate practical ideas for child care (See Appendix B).
4. Developing a public information package composed of radio public service announcements, a slide show and script on family day care regulation, and a pamphlet entitled "Day Care is More Than Just Babysitting." The media package addresses the legal requirement to be licensed or registered, the benefits available through regulation, and the importance of family day care homes as a community service (See Appendix C).
5. Writing of a series of newspaper articles on family day care homes which are released quarterly to the newspapers with circulation within the experimental counties to inform the general public and unlicensed/unregistered providers about family day care.

Of these items, the newsletter is the most popular. Some providers wrote the newsletter "editor" with suggestions they wanted to share with other family day care home providers. The content and format of the newletters are simple and provided helpful hints in an easily understandable, two-page informational tool. The resource packet is readily accepted, with providers indicating the materials are helpful. The resource library has limited use by providers and by Department staff.

The media package, slide show and script was used initially by staff although a central office staff person worked individually with each local office staff to "adapt" the slide show to meet each county's perceived needs. Some staff expressed comfort and excitement in making community presentations; others want the media package to disappear.

The pamphlet and inserts received high acceptance by local office staff. The staff were very willing to distribute the pamphlet which is simple and attractive. The title of the pamphlet, "Day Care is More Than Just Babysitting", interestingly became the theme of a statewide Family Day Care Conference held April 1 & 2, 1977.

Department of Social Services staff had the assistance of several public and private agencies in the development of the information component. Assistance was obtained from the Michigan Department of Public Health, Michigan Dairy Council, Michigan Cooperative Extension, Upjohn Company, Michigan Department of Management and Budget, Cinema Associates of Lansing, St. Lawrence Hospital Poison Control Center, and the Michigan Community Coordinated Child Care Council.

The training component consisted of the operationalization of an ongoing training plan for family day care home providers and department regulatory staff.

The provider training aspect, along with the information component, was developed with the awareness of its applicability for future statewide use. In exploring the training resources available, one organization, Michigan State University Cooperative Extension Service, was identified as a statewide resource which was located in each county and which offered expertise in child development, home management, budgeting, nutrition, safety and money management. Contact was made with State Cooperative Extension personnel to discuss the possibility of involving the county extension offices located within the experimental counties. Cooperative Extension Service assisted the Project by conducting group meetings for family day care home providers on topics of interest.

The interest in the group meetings continued in some counties (Marquette and Midland) and quickly dwindled in the other counties. The relationship between Cooperative Extension Service and the local Department of Social Services staff impacted on the degree of interest. Where the interest was high on the part of both the Department of Social Services staff and the home economist, the interest in continuing with group meetings remained high. When the responsibility to keep the meetings going rested primarily with the Department of Social Services local office staff person, it became a low priority task, particularly as the number of homes regulated increased (with the exception of Midland).

A training plan for department workers was developed to include:

1. An introduction to the Project and the data collection tools.
2. An interpretation of the new family day care home administrative rules.
3. A licensing workshop with Norris Class, national regulatory expert, on the theoretical base of regulatory administration and the licensing process.

4. An interpretation of manual procedures for licensing or registration.
5. The use of the mass media package and how to make community contacts to disseminate the information throughout the county.
6. Consultation skills to upgrade child care services.
7. Confrontation skills dealing with non-compliance issues.
8. Skill in dealing with resistance to regulation.
9. A workshop on current issues in regulation and child care.

Discussions with county staff served as valuable input in deciding on content areas of the training plan with training sessions planned on a quarterly basis.

C. Overview of the Registration Process

Theoretical concepts outlined by Norris Class and Gwen Morgan were studied in relation to current day care licensing practices in Michigan. Staff of local Department of Social Services offices and Department of Health, Education and Welfare personnel worked with the central office staff to design a registration process which was consistent with the with the conceptual framework of registration and the statutory base of Act 116, P.A. 1973, while at the same time being sensitive to its field practicability for the State of Michigan.

Operationally, registration is composed of two phases: the act of registering and registration supervision. It is built on the assumptions that most people wish to comply with the laws of the State and that most family day care homes are in compliance with the majority of the family day care rules. The first phase begins with an inquiry from an individual interested in family day care. At this time, the inquirer receives a packet containing the information and forms necessary for registration. Upon receiving the packet, the inquirer is to read carefully the materials to determine if his home meets the administrative rules. The person, also, must contact three individuals who are willing to serve as references and are willing to complete the reference release statements enclosed in the inquiry packet. These statements function as the community's endorsements of the care the person will give day care children.

The person takes the three reference statements to the local county Department of Social Services office to register. At the local office, the person completes and signs a Statement of Registration, the legal document on which he certifies that he complies and will continue to comply with the Act and rules. The registrant's signature is witnessed by a department representative who is available to answer any questions and to give further interpretation of the rules. Prior to leaving the office, the registrant is given a packet of resource materials on child care.

The registration renewal process follows the same format as an original registration, except that a visit to the county office is not required. The Statement of Registration may be completed by mail if the registrant's signature is notarized.

The registration is in effect for two years from the date of the signature on the Statement of Registration, as long as the registrant continues to meet the rules and remains living at the same address. The Department of Social Services has regulatory responsibility for supervising the home during the registration period. Supervision is conducted on the basis of random spot checks. Also, the Department follows up all complaints having the potential of rule violations with an on-site evaluation.

Monthly, a random sample of registered homes is drawn to determine which homes will be investigated for compliance during the coming month. Each registrant is given advance notice of the spot check visit and is informed of the visit's purpose. A worker, when visiting the home, inspects the home for compliance with the Act and all administrative rules. References are also contacted for a further statement on the registrant's suitability to meet the needs of children.

Complaints are one means by which the community notifies the Department of Social Services of the need for increased supervision of a particular home. Upon receiving a complaint, a Department worker makes a spot check visit to the home to assess compliance with the rule(s) alleged to be in violation.

A home will not be inspected during the two-year registration period if it is not selected for a spot check or if a complaint is not received on the home. Thus, registration supervision allows department staff to be available to supervise a greater number of homes, to give closer supervision to those homes needing additional help, and to offer consultation services to those homes requesting assistance for improving child care.

D. County Selection

Act No. 116, P.A. 1973, states "the Department may conduct in up to three counties a two-year demonstration project of registration". Given this parameter which limits the registration process to a maximum of three counties, the department chose two sets of counties containing three matched counties in each set. Set I counties were counties having a 1973 population of over 100,000 people compared to Set II counties having a 1973 population of under 100,000. Each set would have two experimental counties and one control county listed as A, B, and C with:

Experimental County A - conducting registration.
Experimental County B - conducting enriched licensing
Experimental County C - conducting licensing as currently practiced.

One of the first tasks in the selection of counties was to identify the total population to which final findings were to apply. This population was defined geographically to the State of Michigan with the sampling units, authorized in Section 9 of Act No. 116, P.A. of 1973, to be counties having populations of less than 1,000,000 people. A map of Michigan showing the Department of Social Services' regional units and the counties contained in each region, was used as a source list.

Sampling was done by a quota method with the following conditions established:

1. The counties should have a large enough population so that the conclusions from the sampling can be considered valid and reliable enough to be representative of the state.

2. The counties should reflect as much of an urban-rural composition as possible.

3. Only the control counties could be adjacent geographically to each other. Experimental counties could not be adjacent, nor could experimental and control counties be adjacent.

After reviewing the 1973 population data on 83 counties in relation to the three aforementioned conditions and the Act's exclusion of counties having a population of more than 1,000,000, 13 counties were selected as potential matches. Approximately half of these 13 counties had similar population statistics over 100,000 and half had population statistics of under 100,000. All 13 counties were grouped according to population:

a) Under 100,000 people

Shiawassee
Midland
Marquette
Chippewa
Alpena
Allegan
Livingston

b) Over 100,000 people

Kent
Saginaw
Kalamazoo
Washtenaw
Genesee
Ingham

Geographic location and measures of employment, day care, estimated 1974 population and labor force participation were gathered on the 13 selected counties by the Day Care Licensing Division of the Office of Inter-Agency Services and the Social Services Evaluation and Program Analysis Division. Specific variables examined were:

1. Estimated 1974 total population.
2. Median family income.
3. Number ADC-regular cases.
4. Number of women with children under six.
5. Number and percent of women who work with children under six.
6. Unemployment rate.
7. Number of licensed family day care homes.
8. Number of licensed day care centers and nursery schools.
9. Capacity of licensed family day care schools.
10. Capacity of licensed day care centers and nursery schools.
11. Number of migrants using day care.

The above variables were matched as closely as possible for the 13 counties. The purpose of matching the counties was to allow for more accurate evaluation and comparison of the regulatory processes.

After all of the above had been considered, Livingston, Alpena, Allegan, and Chippewa had been eliminated from the grouping of small counties. Livingston did not reflect a balance in its urban-rural composition as the county is mainly rural.

Chippewa and Alpena were omitted because of their distance from Lansing. This factor was believed to be of significance due to limited project funds, the cost of travel to and from the county site for central office and local office staff, and the means of travel available to reach the county sites.

In the second grouping of counties, three of the six large counties were omitted. Two counties, Kent and Genesee, were eliminated due to their population size being 200,000 greater than any other counties in the grouping and a third county was not available to serve as a match. The third large county omitted was Saginaw with an ADC caseload four times greater than the remaining three large counties in the sample.*

Final determination of which of the remaining three counties in each set would be the two experimental - registration and enriched licensing - and which would be control - licensing - was based on operational factors of proximity to Lansing for supervision, data collection, use of limited resources, and the current emphasis in the counties for greater use of home day care than center day care. The counties tentatively selected for the following regulatory approaches were:

Set 1
County A - Registration: Kalamazoo
County B - Enriched Licensing: Washtenaw
County C - Licensing as currently practiced: Ingham

Set 2
County A - Registration: Midland
County B - Enriched Licensing: Marquette
County C - Licensing as currently practiced: Shiawassee

---

*The selection of Midland and Washtenaw Counties further eliminated Saginaw and Livingston Counties as Project sites due to their adjacent location to two of the experimental counties.

In early February, 1974, six Regional Directors were requested to consider the tentative inclusion of a county in his region and to indicate a willingness to have that county included as a part of the Project. All reactions were positive, thus finalizing the county selection.

Local office Project staff were contacted in early summer of 1974 to introduce the staff to the Project, its purpose, design, and data collection components (See Appendix A). Experimental county staff met separately from control county staff with the controls receiving a general overview of the Project as compared to lengthly discussions with the experimental counties on the proposed regulatory processes.

It was originally hoped that the controls would be able to remain anonymous. However, this was not operationally feasible as no available means existed to retrieve the needed data from each control county with the current Social Services' reporting systems. It was, therefore, necessary for all regulatory workers in Project counties to collect data.

Initial staff reactions to the Project were mixed; each county was pleased with the regulatory process it was assigned. Reasons for each county's acceptance of its assigned regulatory approach generated from four areas:

1. Control counties were content to collect only Project data as this meant they would not be bothered with other additional expectations.
2. "Enriched" counties displayed skepticism of registration, feeling its potential of harm to children was great. Therefore, the staffs were pleased to be able to continue with licensing.
3. The four licensing counties, also, questioned whether a family day care provider would truthfully certify that he had complied with the rules. Each county felt a department representative's visit to the home was necessary prior to issuing a license or a Certificate of

Registration to assure the rules were met.

4. Although the registration counties experienced some skepticism of registration, they were interested in demonstrating a new regulatory approach. Realizing the limitations of licensing family day care with the current staffing levels, these counties were interested in learning if registration offered advantages.

Throughout the development of the registration and enriched licensing processes, the experimental counties were involved in providing input on field procedures, characteristics, and problems. The more involved each county became in the process development, the more supportive they were of the final output.

E. Planning Difficulties

As the development of the planning stages progressed, a number of difficulties arose which needed to be resolved. These difficulties and their solutions are enumerated below:

1. The establishment of a direct, fast communication line from Central Office to the county worker and supervisor. Permission was obtained from the Administration to bypass the official communication line from Central Office to Local County offices.
2. The development of operational field procedures for registration of family day care homes from a conceptual framework which was basically untried anywhere in the United States. Excellent input was obtained from the Project counties on specific field characteristics and from national consultants who viewed the design from a broad conceptual perspective and previous regulatory experience.
3. The comparison of data drawn on homes licensed under the foster care rules to homes licensed or registered under new family day care home's administra-

tive rules. Comparison was drawn between selected "like" rules contained in both sets of administrative rules.

4. The development of a population of registered providers early in the Project from which data could be drawn for at least four data quarters of the year. Licensed providers in the registration counties were encouraged to convert to registration and the new rules as part of the Project. This proved to be successful, as data was drawn on registered homes by the third month of the Project.

5. The handling of staff turnover at the county and regional level; the improvement of the clerical support available to workers, and the decrease in the number of regulatory cases assigned to each worker. Staff turnover was and continues to be great, causing a continual need to retrain workers. Gains made in regulatory caseloads were temporary. New workers were hired and would then leave and the positions would be frozen or reassigned. (Clerical support also improved temporary in most counties so worker time does need not be spent on typing, filing, or sending out mailings.)

6. The development of a media package which was non-threatening while at the same time informed people of the law and encouraged providers to become licensed or registered. A media package was developed which communicated an explanation of family day care, the advantages of being regulated including the protections offered to parents, providers, and children, and the Act requirement that all persons providing this type of care need to be registered or licensed. No mention was made of the Act's penalties for not being licensed or registered.

F. Operational Difficulties

As the Project progressed, several operational difficulties arose which needed to be addressed or acknowledged. These difficulties and related comments are listed below:

1. The determination of total number of children actually receiving care in family day care rather than the total licensed capacity in the homes. While the workers conducted quarterly random spot checks for determining compliance with rules, they also determined the number of children actually in care. These spot checks, along with information from the provider questionnaire, served as the basis of an estimate of the total number of children in care in the Project counties.
2. The decrease in number of staff or reduction in staff time devoted to registration and the increase in number of registered homes. Because of the staffing problems in the registration counties (staff reassigned to other services part-time and the realignment of staff responsibilities), the percentage of spot check visits had to be reduced from 8% to 5%. Currently, one registration county is operating with one worker to 700 homes; the worker has about 27 spot check visits monthly as well as the other registration responsibilities. In addition, she only has 20% of a clerical person's time to assist her.
3. Physician statements and TB test results for registrants were difficult for workers to obtain. In an evaluation meeting with the Project counties, the registration workers voiced their concern about the difficulty in obtaining provider health information. At the same time, each worker agreed that requiring all the health information at the time of registration would dramatically complicate the process. There was less resistance regarding the obtaining of TB test results at the time of registration.
4. Workers in the registration counties continued to use the term "licensing" in everyday conversation. We found the change from "licensing" jargon to "registration" jargon for workers to be more complicated than expected. An assumption can be drawn that the change from a traditional regulatory process,

licensing, to registration requires attitudinal and language changes which take longer to achieve.

5. A hint from some providers that the increase in regulated homes may have an effect on competition and that a license may be viewed as more prestigious than a Certificate of Registration.

Chapter 4. METHODS

Through the Project design, licensing and registration are being compared from the operational viewpoints of effectiveness, efficiency and economy to test the following hypotheses:

H.1. Registration counties will have a higher percent of increase in the number of children receiving care in regulated family day care homes than the licensing counties.

H.2. Registration counties will have the same or a lower percent of regulated homes having rule violations than the licensing counties.

H.3. Registration counties will have the same or a lower expenditure of funds per home regulated than the licensing counties.

H.4. Providers in registration counties will be more willing to become regulated than the providers in licensing counties.

Pre data was collected for the first year of the Project on the basis of one month per quarter year. This data established a base line of county activity for family day care homes in the areas of inquiries, adverse actions, number of homes regulated, staffing patterns, cost per home regulated, and complaints. Seasonal trends within each county were identified and the differences between counties such as the employment situation, composition of the Department of Social Services staff, and the community resources available were noted. During this time the data instruments were tested as to clarity, ability to collect needed data, and ease of use.

Project data comparing the two regulatory processes began August, 1975, and continued for one and a half years. Project data months were October, 1975, January, 1976, April, 1976, August, 1976 and October, 1976, thus allowing time for the impact of input components (new licensing rules, new regulatory procedures, spot checks to determine continued compliance, and public service media package) to be measured.

Data collection during a data month began the first working day of the month and continued through the last working day of the month. Collection occurred at state and county levels depending on where the most accurate source of information was located. In order to prove the four Project hypotheses, a number of areas were examined. A further explanation of each of these areas follows below:

1. Number of Homes Regulated. Data was drawn on the number of licensed/registered day care providers from Department of Social Services computer provider listings run during the given data month.
2. Number of Child Slots Available. The Department of Social Services provider listing also included the total number of children for which each home was licensed or registered, thus enabling monthly totals of capacity to be determined for the Project.
3. Provider Attitudes. A questionnaire to measure provider attitudes as they relate to state regulation was mailed to all registered and licensed providers in the Project in the fall of 1976. The mailing list was taken from the Department of Social Services computer provider listing.
4. Inquiries about Family Day Care. Tallies are completed by county staff for each inquiry (mail, phone, and walk-in) received. At the time of each inquiry, an assessment was done as to whether the inquirer had heard a part of the media package, thus causing them to inquire. Data showed very few people inquiring for this reason.
5. Number of Complaints Received. Complaints of three types were tallied:
   a) any complaints on non-regulated day care homes.
   b) complaints which are not rule related on regulated homes.
   c) complaints which are rule related on regulated homes.

Specific rules allegedly in violation were also charted to determine the potential life/safety factors involved for children in care.

It is noted that the data collected on the number of inquiries and complaints were not significant, therefore, in the chapter on findings, there is no reference made to either inquiries or complaints.

Chapter 5. FINDINGS

Four hypotheses were tested in this demonstration project. The pre-project and project data which test these hypotheses are presented with a brief discussion and analysis. The analysis is based on twelve months of pre-project data and eighteen months of project data.

H.1. Registration counties will have a higher percent of increase in the number of children receiving care in regulated family day care than licensing counties.

Table 1 presents the number of homes regulated under the different approaches (i.e., registration, enriched licensing, regular licensing). The number of homes regulated was drawn from the monthly computer listing of regulated homes (i.e., BG037, CC035). The greatest increase in the number of homes regulated was reported in the registration counties. The regular licensing counties reported a decrease in the number of homes regulated.

This finding suggests that the registration process increases the number of homes regulated in comparison to the regular licensing process.

Table 2 presents the number of child slots that are available in the regulated homes. These data were also drawn from the same source as listed in Table 1 (i.e., BG037, CC035). The results parallel the findings noted above.

Table 3 estimates the number of Department of Social Services children that receive day care in these counties in a family day care home setting. This group accounts for approximately 16 percent of all licensed capacity and about 25 percent of all those who receive care in this setting in any given month.* These data were drawn from the payment system (BGQ24).

---

*According to the spot check procedure introduced in the registration counties, only 63 percent of the total capacity is ever utilized in a given month.

The results indicate that in registration counties there was an increase in the number of Department of Social Services children cared for whereas in the regular licensed counties there was a decrease.

A direct count of the number of children actually being cared for before the project and during the project is not available. However, it was found that an increase in the number of homes regulated was accompanied by an increase in the number of child slots available and an increase in DSS children cared for in family day care homes. In general, there was an increase in registration counties and a decrease in regular licensed counties.

Hypothesis 1 is generally supported by the data: namely, registration counties have a higher percent of increase in the number of children receiving family day care than licensing counties. This seems to be more characteristic of the larger counties than the smaller counties.

H.2. Registration counties will have the same or a lower percent of rule violations than the licensing counties.

Rule violations were observed in random spot-check visits in registration counties and original, renewal, and periodic visits in the other counties.

Table 4 summarizes the rule violations. In general, there is a higher percent of homes in violation of rules in the registration counties than there are in the licensing counties. Smaller licensing counties had a higher percentage of rule violations than the larger counties.

Only a few rules (2-5) were violated in registration counties whereas in licensing counties a wider variety of rules were found in violation (7-17). In registration counties the most frequently violated rules were providers lacking physician and TB statements and emergency notorization for health care for children. The rules in violation in the licensing counties included home maintenance, record keeping, sanitation (private water/sewage systems), protected outdoor play area, and TB statements.

H.3. Registration counties will have the same or lower expenditures of funds per child protected than the licensing counties.

The costs involved in the different regulatory approaches have been collected in the areas of personnel, transportation, training, information programs and miscellaneous costs (i.e., library material).

The total average costs per quarter are outlined in Table 5. There are a number of factors to consider in reviewing this information.

- Not all costs are comparable across all three regulatory methods. For example, the regular licensing counties do not need to be trained in a new process whereas the other counties, especially the registration counties, received much more training.

- Some of the costs are also one-time expenditures (i.e., mass media package).

- The largest cost factor is service worker salaries (approximately 85 percent). County administrators throughout the project shifted licensing and registration staff (especially part-time staff) according to changing priorities to other departmental programs (i.e., day care payments). Only two licensing counties (i.e., Washtenaw and Ingham) remained relatively stable in their allocation of full-time service workers in the licensing function. Consequently, these two licensing counties most accurately reflect the actual expenses in operating this regulatory function. The costs reported for the other counties should be considered a conservative estimate.

With these limitations in mind, the cost information can be reviewed.

- Costs increased in most of the counties with no clear pattern emerging across regulatory processes.

- Costs per home regulated indicates that the larger counties generally have a lower cost regardless of the regulatory process.

- When controlling for county size, the least expensive homes to regulate are the registration homes.

H.4. Providers in registration counties will be more willing to become regulated than the providers in licensing counties.

Table 1 has already illustrated the fact that there is a higher percentage increase of homes being regulated in registration counties. This suggests that more providers are willing to become regulated under this approach than through enriched licensing or regular licensing.

In order to obtain more information on the reaction of providers to the regulatory process, a questionnaire was sent to all family day care home providers in the six counties. Approximately 1,900 providers were included in the initial mailing in October, 1976 and in a follow-up mailing in November. A total of 1,153 completed responses were returned and are included in the following analysis (Table 6). This return rate of 61 percent reflects the provider interest in the regulatory process.

The questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

Several demographic characteristics of the respondents are summarized below:

- The average number of total children (i.e., provider's children plus day care children) cared for by a day care home provider is 3.9 (Table 7).
- The average number of day care children cared for is 2.5 (Table 8).
- The average number of day care children who have care paid for by their parents is 1.75 (Table 9).
- The balance of children is assumed to be paid for by DSS.
- In short, DSS children are a small minority of total children being provided care in family day care homes. They comprise about 25 percent of all children in the home and about 33 percent of those receiving day care. The total range of ages was from 0 to over 10 years with about one percent over 10.
- Over 50 percent of all children are four years of age or younger with a higher proportion of older children being cared for in the smaller counties. It is assumed that this probably occurs because of the lack of centers in smaller counties (See Table 10).

The major findings from the questions relating to licensing/registration processes are outlined below:

- Most respondents (74 percent) reported that rules for regulatory day care homes are helpful in the care of children (Table 11). The most frequently reported reason why such rules were considered not helpful was that the providers felt good care would be provided without such rules (Table 12).

- The providers initial response to both regulation processes were similar with only a small number reporting negative reactions (See Table 13).

- The highest percentage of all providers in each county felt the regulation process they experienced was handled well. One difference did appear, however, with the second highest percentage of responses. The providers in the registration counties felt the process was "easy" whereas licensing counties viewed the process as "interesting" (See Table 14).

- Registration process.
  - 96 percent of providers claimed they met the rules at the time of signing the statement of registration (Table 15).
  - 78 percent of providers also reported that the signing of the statement of registration helped to protect children in day care homes (Table 16).
  - 65 percent of providers felt that spot check visits were needed to make a registered home meet the rules (Table 17).

- Licensing process.
  - 66 percent of providers felt that the home visit makes a difference in how a provider meets the rules (Table 18).

- Spot Check Process.
  - 59 percent of all providers reported that they had been spot checked with a higher percent of providers in registration counties claiming they

had been spot checked (Table 19).

- The most frequently cited initial reaction to a spot check visit (regardless of regulation process) was that the provider was confident they met the rules (Table 20).

- After the spot check, 97 percent of providers felt "good about it" (the visit), (Table 21).

- 95 percent of providers felt that one spot check did not insure that a home won't be checked again (Table 22).

. Preferences of providers indicated that 50 percent preferred licensing and 43 percent reported that it made no difference. Only the remaining seven percent preferred registration (Table 23).

. Mass media.

- 54 percent of providers were aware of mass media directed at family day care home regulation (Table 24).

- 83 percent of providers reported that parents did not ask them about information they received via the mass media (Table 25). Of those who did ask, their most frequently raised question referred to whether the provider was licensed/registered (Table 26).

- The most frequently noted sources of information that providers contended were helpful in providing family day care were the Caregiver newsletter and the packet of day care material from the county DSS office. Together they account for 75 percent of all sources (Table 22).

. DSS County Office Availability.

- 96 percent of providers felt that they could contact their DSS county office regarding questions on family day care homes (Table 28).

- Only 52 percent of providers have ever asked their DSS worker for help in answering day care questions (Table 29). Of those who did ask, approximately 95 percent found such answers helpful (Table 30).

SUMMARY

The questionnaire responses do not support the fourth hypothesis that providers in registration counties will be more willing to become regulated than providers in licensing counties. There were surprisingly few differences among the regulatory processes investigated and there was no clear preference in favor of registration. Only seven percent of the respondents indicated a preference for registration over licensing and 43 percent had no preference at all.

The providers as a group were relatively pleased with either regulatory process.

Chapter 6. CONCLUSIONS

This demonstration project was designed to investigate the feasibility of regulating family day care homes via a process that would be easier, less expensive and cover more homes than the present licensing process. This new alternative - the registration process - was also expected to provide the same degree of compliance to regulatory rules as the present licensing process.

The demonstration has shown that registration (1) is perceived as easier, (2) is less expensive and does regulate more homes. However, it does not provide as much compliance as licensing.

The consequent trade-off is between having a regulatory process which covers more homes but does so less effectively (i.e., registration) or having a regulatory process which covers fewer homes but does so more effectively (i.e., licensing).

The licensing function in the Department of Social Services is to assure the public (consumers) that the homes caring for day care children are providing a base level of care. The present licensing process provides better compliance with certain administrative rules than the registration process. Without making necessary modifications to assure an equal level of safeguarding, it would be irresponsible for the state to opt for a regulation process that would provide less safety although it would be easier, cheaper and cover more homes. However, the rules being violated by most homes under the registration process are confined to only a few (i.e., TB tests, medical statements). If the registration process could be modified to insure that these rules were followed, additional savings per home regulated would be realized with this type of regulatory process.

The cost data collected in this report indicate that registration is 50 percent less expensive than licensing in the larger counties and 25 percent less expensive in smaller counties.

There are approximately 10,000 family day care homes in the State. The cost data suggests an average quarterly savings of $3.00 per regulated home (regardless of county size) would be realized if the registration process is used rather than the present licensing process. The annual savings would amount to approximately $120,000 ($3.00 x 4 x 10,000 = $120,000). This potential for such cost savings is an important factor in deciding on the most appropriate regulatory process.

It should be emphasized that these estimated savings are on a per home basis and not an aggregate basis. The total number of homes will probably increase with the registration process. Thus, the overall regulation costs will probably remain the same or increase as a result of this change.

The data indicates that the registration process results in more homes being regulated at a lower cost per home. It is estimated that approximately 62% more homes can be regulated for the same cost via the registration process than can be regulated by the licensing process.

The decrease in the number of licensed homes in the control counties indicates that fewer homes are being regulated than in the past. This trend may be offset by the decision to register homes as there seems to be greater acceptance of this process by potential providers.

The interim report on this project (February, 1976) outlined several appropriate steps in reducing the rule violations in the registration process.

1. The requirement of proof of freedom from communicable tuberculosis to be presented at the time of registering along with the currently required reference statements.

2. An increased emphasis on rule interpretation and the importance of rules at the time of registration.

3. An increase in the monitoring of registration homes by increasing the random sample of registered homes which is now being spot checked monthly.

These steps are included in the Department's recommendation.

Chapter 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the Project's findings and after careful consideration of those findings and their consequences, the Department recommends to the Legislature the following:

1. The process of registration be utilized statewide as the method by which family day care homes are to be regulated.
2. The statute, Act No. 116 of the Public Acts of 1973, be changed to reflect this regulatory process with appropriate provisions for a pre-issuance investigation procedure if deemed necessary, a denial procedure, a revocation procedure and an adequate level of supervision.
3. The Department administer the registration process in such a manner so as to reduce the rate of rule violations as found in this Project's registered homes. It is suggested that this can be done by:
    a. Requiring an applicant to submit proof of freedom from communicable TB before registration;
    b. Stressing the importance of rules and the interpretation of rules at the time of registration;
    c. Providing an adequate number of staff so the number of homes that are spot-checked can be increased (i.e., a stronger emphasis on regulatory supervision);
    d. Maintaining a percentage of 10% spot checks per month.

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1. Number of Homes Regulated 41
2. Number of Child Slots 42
3. Number of DSS Children 43
4. Rule Violations 44
5. Average Costs Per Quarter 45
6. Questionnaire Respondents 46
7. Children Regulated 47
8. Day Care Children 48
9. Care Paid for by Parents 49
10. Average Age of Day Care Children 50
11. Do Rules Help? 51
12. Reasons Why Rules Don't Help 52
13. Initial Reaction About Being Licensed/Registered 53
14. Post Process Reaction to Being Licensed 54
15. Provider's Perception of Compliance to Rules 55
16. Does Registration Help Protect Children? 56
17. Are Spot Checks Needed? 57
18. Did Home Visits Make a Difference? 58
19. Spot Checks 59
20. Initial Reaction to Spot Checks 60
21. Post Spot Check Reaction 61
22. After Spot Check Will Home Be Checked Again? 62
23. Preferences for Regulatory Process 63
24. Provider Exposure to Mass Media 64

Page

25. Parent's Exposure to Mass Media 65

26. Parent's Questions 66

27. Most Helpful Sources of Information 67

28. Availability of DSS County Offices 68

29. Did You Ask Worker Questions? 69

30. How Helpful Were Answers? 70

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF HOMES REGULATED

Months of Data Collection	Big Counties			Small Counties		
	Registration (Kalamazoo)	Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)	Reg. Licensing (Ingham)	Registration (Midland)	Enr. Licensing (Marquette)	Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)
Pre-Data						
1974 August	352	307	658	95	78	88
October	366	307	655	95	84	83
1975 January	394	328	638	93	89	85
April	404	349	658	94	90	82
Average	379	323	652	94	85	85
Project Data						
1975 August	512	360	686	112	108	83
October	577	351	679	117	107	81
1976 January	593	365	652	120	117	73
April	642	349	660	125	107	75
August	678	322	601	123	107	71
October	700	309	581	138	101	66
Average	617	343	643	123	108	75
Difference between pre and project data	+238	+ 20	- 9	+29	+23	-10
% change	+ 63%	+ 6%	- 1%	+31%	+27%	-12%

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF CHILD SLOTS

Months of Data Collection	Big Counties			Small Counties		
	Registration (Kalamazoo)	Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)	Reg. Licensing (Ingham)	Registration (Midland)	Enr. Licensing (Marquette)	Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)
Pre-Data						
1974 August	1,094	1,010	2,021	319	193	269
October	1,171	1,031	2,050	316	179	269
1975 January	1,286	1,180	2,004	304	213	297
April	1,374	1,289	2,078	317	224	295
Average	1,231	1,128	2,038	314	207	283
Project Data						
1975 August	1,739	1,305	2,122	372	250	296
October	1,981	1,300	2,132	386	258	289
1976 January	2,038	1,349	2,000	406	290	271
April	2,234	1,329	2,199	432	280	273
August	2,474	1,325	2,107	431	305	279
October	2,589	1,311	2,066	473	284	264
Average	2,176	1,320	2,104	417	278	278
Difference between pre and project data	+945	+192	+ 66	+103	+71	-5
% change	+ 77%	+ 17%	+ 3%	+ 33%	+34%	-2%

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF DSS CHILDREN

Months of Data Collection	Big Counties			Small Counties		
	Registration (Kalamazoo)	Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)	Reg. Licensing (Ingham)	Registration (Midland)	Enr. Licensing (Marquette)	Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)
Pre-Data						
1974 August	211	181	320	44	43	70
October	239	160	328	62	46	69
1975 January	285	208	372	75	53	55
April	293	213	322	81	35	47
Average	257	191	336	66	44	60
Project Data						
1975 August	286	172	256	81	42	42
October	319	197	263	66	40	25
1976 January	376	244	362	71	53	48
April	447	230	427	79	69	56
August	318	154	266	68	56	33
October	523	247	344	104	62	53
Average	378	207	319	78	54	43
Difference between pre and project data	+121	+16	-17	+12	+10	-17
% change	+ 47%	+ 8%	- 5%	+18%	+23%	-28%

TABLE 4

RULE VIOLATIONS

Months of Data Collection	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
		Total Checked		Total Checked		Total Checked		Total Checked		Total Checked		Total Checked
Project Data												
1975 August	0		1		4		0		0		0	
October	6	(10)	8	(44)	16	(100)	4	(4)	7	(12)	3	(27)
1976 January	6	(20)	3	(9)	12	(66)	4	(4)	-		1	(3)
April	3	(14)	6	(37)	23	(127)	3	(7)	1	(6)	7	(21)
August	9	(9)	7	(70)	21	(67)	3	(7)	4	(15)	-	
October	10	(14)	1	(50)	11	(122)	2	(4)	6	(12)	7	(15)
Average	7	(13)	5	(42)	17	(96)	3	(5)	5	(9)	5	(13)
Percent of homes where rules were found in violation		(54%)		(12%)		(18%)		(60%)		(55%)		(38%)

TABLE 5

AVERAGE COSTS PER QUARTER

Costs (Average) Pre-Project and Project Data	Big Counties			Small Counties		
	Registration (Kalamazoo)	Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)	Reg. Licensing (Ingham)	Registration (Midland)	Enr. Licensing (Marquette)	Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)
Costs (Average) Pre-Project Data						
Personnel	$1,118.00	$2,143.00	$2,853.00	$593.00	$580.00	$805.00
Transportation	67.76	72.55	151.73	16.05	32.54	20.01
Training	515.50	410.03	51.70	392.99	298.33	39.72
Information Programs	3.52	30.36	0	0	4.12	0
Other	2.60	2.60	0	2.35	2.35	0
Total	1,707.37	2,658.54	3,056.43	1,004.39	917.34	864.73
Homes	379	323	652	94	85	85
Cost Per Home Regulated	$4.50	$8.23	$4.69	$10.69	$10.79	$10.17
Project Data						
Personnel	$1,503.50	$2,104.33	$3,622.00	$403.00	$530.00	$648.16
Transportation	22.52	68.08	93.95	10.22	18.28	26.28
Training	24.22	159.44	125.68	157.42	232.20	74.56
Information Programs	372.55	381.02	64.00	324.34	323.45	0
Other (Library Materials)	.50	.50	0	.25	.25	0
Total	$1,923.39	$2,713.37	$3,905.63	$895.23	$1,104.18	$749.00
Homes	617	343	643	123	108	82
Cost Per Home Regulated	$3.12	$7.91	$6.07	$7.28	$10.22	$9.13
Difference between pre and project data	-1.38	-.32	+1.38	-3.41	-.57	-1.04
% change	-31%	- 4%	+ 29%	- 32%	- 5%	- 10%

TABLE 6

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS

Question #1 No. of Respondents	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Respondents (N=1153)	401	(35)	189	(16)	364	(32)	89	(8)	65	(6)	45	(47)
Average number of homes regulated (August 1975 - October 1976) (N=1909)	617	(32)	343	(18)	643	(34)	123	(6)	108	(6)	75	(4)

NOTE: There does not appear to be a non-response bias in the proportion of providers who returned completed questionnaires. About the same proportion of respondents per county returned their questionnaire as the proportion of regulated homes in each county. For example, Kalamazoo County represents 32 percent of all regulated homes in our study and 35 percent of all questionnaire responses come from Kalamazoo County.

TABLE 7

CHILDREN REGULATED

Question #2	Big Counties			Small Counties		
	Registration (Kalamazoo)	Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)	Reg. Licensing (Ingham)	Registration (Midland)	Enr. Licensing (Marquette)	Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)
Average number of children regulated per provider to care for (Not the number providers are actually caring for)	3.8 (N=388)	4.4 (N=184)	3.8 (N=358)	3.9 (N=89)	3.2 (N=67)	4.1 (N=44)
Estimated number of children regulated to care for*	(N=1474)	(N=810)	(N=1360)	(N=347)	(N=214)	(N=180)

*This estimate was calculated by multiplying the average number of children by the number of providers.

NOTE: The average number of children regulated per provider was 3.9. It was calculated by dividing the estimated number of children across all counties (N=4385) by the number of providers (N=1130).

TABLE 8

DAY CARE CHILDREN

Question #4	Big Counties			Small Counties		
	Registration (Kalamazoo)	Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)	Reg. Licensing (Ingham)	Registration (Midland)	Enr. Licensing (Marquette)	Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)
Average number of day care children	2.2 (N=390)	3.2 (N=185)	2.5 (N=355)	2.6 (N=85)	2.1 (N=67)	2.3 (N=41)
Estimated number of children receiving day care*	(N=858)	(N=592)	(N=888)	(N=24)	(N=141)	(N=94)

*This estimate was determined by multiplying the average number of children by the number of providers.

NOTE: The average number of children receiving day care was 2.5. This was determined by dividing the estimated number of children across all counties (N=2794) by the number of providers (N=1123).

TABLE 9

CARE PAID FOR BY PARENTS

Question #4a	Big Counties			Small Counties		
	Registration (Kalamazoo)	Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)	Reg. Licensing (Ingham)	Registration (Midland)	Enr. Licensing (Marquette)	Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)
Average number of day care children whose care is paid for by parents	1.2	2.8	1.8	2.2	1.4	1.6
Providers	(N=350)	(N=169)	(N=317)	(N=63)	(N=55)	(N=34)
Estimated number of day care children whose care is paid for by parents*	(N=420)	(N=473)	(N=570)	(N=139)	(N=77)	(N=54)

*This estimate was calculated by multiplying the average number of children by the number of providers.

NOTE: The average number of children per provider whose care is paid for by their parents is 1.75. This was calculated by dividing the total number of children (N=1733) by the total number of providers (N=988).

TABLE 10

AVERAGE AGE OF DAY CARE CHILDREN

Question #4c	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-1 year	88	11	90	15	113	14	12	6	12	10	10	11
1-2 years	151	19	157	26	133	16	30	15	19	15	8	9
2-3 years	133	17	99	16	119	14	35	18	18	14	12	13
3-4 years	118	15	78	13	98	12	31	16	22	16	12	13
4-5 years	96	12	63	10	106	13	22	11	20	15	11	12
5-6 years	57	7	37	6	81	10	15	8	10	8	6	6
6-7 years	40	5	29	5	50	6	20	10	9	7	10	11
7-8 years	31	4	19	3	46	6	11	6	6	5	4	4
8-9 years	22	3	14	2	42	5	8	4	4	3	4	4
9-10 years	20	3	5	1	23	3	6	3	4	3	9	10
10+ years	32	4	10	2	20	2	4	2	6	5	7	8
	(N=788)	100	(N=601)	99	(N=831)	101	(N=194)	99	(N=130)	101	(N=93)	101

TABLE 11

DO RULES HELP?

Question #5 Do day care rules help?	TOTAL		Big Counties						Small Counties					
			Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	833	74	293	75.9	131	68.9	254	72.0	71	81.6	56	84.8	28	63.6
No	293	26	93	24.1	59	31.1	99	28.0	16	18.4	10	15.2	16	36.4
TOTAL	1,126	100.0	386	100.0	190	100.0	353	100.0	87	100.0	66	100.0	44	100.0

TABLE 12

REASONS WHY RULES DON'T HELP

Question 5a	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
If no, reasons why day care rules do not help	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Red tape (N=53, 19%)	11	12.1	7	13.0	24	24.7	5	31.3	1	10.0	5	31.3
2. Too strict (N=9, 3%)	3	3.3	2	3.7	2	2.1	1	6.3	1	10.0	0	0
3. Good care without rules (N=142, 50%)	54	59.3	20	37.0	49	50.5	6	37.5	7	70.0	6	37.5
4. Rules don't relate (N=10, 4%)	4	4.4	4	7.4	2	2.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Too easy (N=9, 4%)	3	3.3	3	5.6	2	2.1	0	0	1	10.0	0	0
6. Other(N=61, 21%)	16	17.6	18	33.3	18	18.6	4	25.0	0	0	5	31.3
TOTAL (N=284)	91	100.0	54	100.0	97	100.0	16	100.0	10	100.0	16	100.0

73

74

TABLE 13

INITIAL REACTION ABOUT BEING LICENSED/REGISTERED

Question #6a, 7a	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Angry	4	1.0	9	2.9	16	2.8	4	3.8	0	0	3	3.9
2. Worried	17	4.1	16	5.1	40	6.9	4	3.8	5	5.2	3	3.9
3. More important	62	15.1	46	14.6	76	13.2	12	11.3	12	12.4	13	17.1
4. Pleased	68	16.6	44	14.0	61	10.6	12	11.3	13	13.4	6	7.9
5. Waste of time	8	2.0	16	5.1	24	4.2	6	5.7	1	1.0	2	2.6
6. Caring must be important	84	20.5	50	15.9	103	17.9	21	19.8*	18	18.6	15	19.7
7. None of state's business	7	1.7	21	6.7	27	4.7	1	0.9	0	0	0	0
8. Glad state is interested	91	22.2*	54	17.2*	118	20.5*	13	12.3	32	33.0*	18	23.7*
9. Not too much one way or another	45	11.0	35	11.1	69	12.0	19	17.9	13	13.4	10	13.2
10. Other	24	5.9	23	7.3	43	7.5	14	13.2	3	3.1	6	7.9
TOTAL	410	100.0	314	100.0	577	100.0	106	100.0	97	100.0	76	100.0

*The most frequently noted response.

TABLE 14

POST PROCESS REACTION TO BEING LICENSED/REGISTERED

Question #6b, 7b	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Was easy	80	23.0	39	12.7	92	16.0	29	25.4	15	15.3	11	14.9
2. Took too long	6	1.7	18	5.9	43	7.5	2	1.8	1	1.0	3	4.1
3. Was interesting	71	20.4	56	18.2	98	17.0	19	16.7	18	18.4	7	9.5
4. Uncomfortable	10	2.9	10	3.3	10	1.7	4	3.5	5	5.1	3	4.1
5. Handled well	104	29.9*	96	31.3*	194	33.7*	40	35.1*	44	44.9*	31	41.9*
6. Unnecessary personal questions	3	0.9	26	8.5	29	5.0	4	3.5	3	3.1	3	3.1
7. Proud	54	15.5	40	13.0	71	12.3	10	8.8	10	10.2	12	16.2
8. Other	20	5.7	22	7.2	39	6.8	6	5.3	2	2.0	4	5.4
TOTAL	348	100.0	307	100.0	576	100.0	114	100.0	98	100.0	74	100.0

*The most frequently reported response.

TABLE 15

PROVIDER'S PERCEPTION OF COMPLIANCE TO RULES IN REGISTRATION COUNTIES

Question #7	Big County		Small County	
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Registration (Midland)	
	N	%	N	%
Did you meet all the rules when you signed the statement of registration?				
Yes (N=308, 96%)	251	98.4	57	86.4
No (N=13, 4%)	4	1.6	9	13.6
TOTAL (N=321, 100%)	255	100.0	66	100.0

TABLE 16

DOES REGISTRATION HELP PROTECT CHILDREN?

Question #7c	Big County Registration (Kalamazoo)		Small County Registration (Midland)	
	N	%	N	%
Do you think registration and signing the statement of registration helps protect children in a day care home?				
Yes (N=248, 77.5%)	197	77.9	51	76.1
No (N=72, 22.5%)	56	22.1	16	23.9
TOTAL	253	100.0	67	100.0

80

TABLE 17

ARE SPOT CHECKS NEEDED?

Question #7d	Big County		Small County	
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Registration (Midland)	
	N	%	N	%
Do you feel spot check visits are needed to make a registered home meet the rules?				
Yes (N=208, 65%)	162	63.8	46	69.7
No (N=112, 35%)	92	36.2	20	30.3
TOTAL (N=320, 100%)	254	100.0	66	100.0

TABLE 18

DID HOME VISITS MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

Question #6c	Big Counties				Small Counties			
	Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did home visit make any difference in how you meet the rules?								
Yes (N=212, 34%)	65	37.4	104	30.8	23	35.4	20	44.4
No (N=410, 66%)	109	62.6	235	69.2	42	64.6	25	55.6
TOTAL (N=622, 100%	174	100.0	338	100.0	65	100.0	45	100.0

TABLE 19

SPOT CHECKS

Question #8	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Have you been visited by a worker for a spot check visit since you were last licensed/registered?												
Yes (N=568, 59%)	214	69.9	86	51.8	169	53.0	45	66.2	38	59.4	16	38.1
No (N=397, 41%)	92	30.1	80	48.2	150	47.0	23	33.8	26	40.6	26	61.9
TOTAL (N=965, 100%)	306	100.0	166	100.0	319	100.0	68	100.0	64	100.0	42	100.0

TABLE 20

INITIAL REACTION TO SPOT CHECKS

Question #8a	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Before the spot check visit did you mostly feel?												
1. Worried	9	5.6	3	2.4	3	1.4	2	4.5	1	3.2	1	2.0
2. Pleased	25	15.6	18	14.2	16	7.6	5	11.4	1	3.2	7	14.0
3. Angry	1	0.6	3	2.4	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Confident you met the rules	57	35.6*	47	37.0*	98	46.4*	16	36.4*	14	45.2*	18	36.0*
5. Not bothered	19	11.9	18	14.2	33	15.6	7	15.9	7	22.6	9	18.0
6. Looking forward to the visit	44	27.5	33	26.0	48	22.7	13	29.5	8	25.8	13	26.0
7. Other	5	3.1	5	3.9	9	4.3	1	2.3	0	0	2	4.0
TOTAL	160	100.0	127	100.0	211	100.0	44	100.0	31	100.0	50	100.0

*Most frequently reported response.

TABLE 21

POST SPOT CHECK REACTION

Question #8b	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
After the spot visit did you mostly feel good about it?												
Yes (N=377, 97%)	89	98.9	78	97.5	141	97.2	18	90.0	26	100.0	25	96.2
No (N=10, 3%)	1	1.1	2	2.5	4	2.8	2	10.0	0	0	1	3.8
TOTAL (N=387)	90	100.0	80	100.0	145	100.0	20	100.0	26	100.0	26	100.0

TABLE 22

AFTER SPOT CHECK WILL HOME BE CHECKED AGAIN?

Question #8c	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Do you think one spot check means a home won't be checked again?												
Yes (N=19, 5%)	5	5.4	3	3.8	8	5.4	1	4.8	0	0	2	8.0
No (N=372, 95%)	88	94.6	75	96.2	141	94.6	20	95.2	25	100.0	23	92.0
TOTAL (N=391, 100%)	93	100.0	78	100.0	149	100.0	21	100.0	25	100.0	25	100.0

TABLE 23

PREFERENCES FOR REGULATORY PROCESS

Question #9	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
As a person giving family day care, which would you rather be?												
1. Registered (N=73, 7%)	37	10.6	9	5.2	11	3.4	10	12.0	3	4.6	3	7.5
2. Licensed (N=518, 50%)	127	36.3	113	65.3	195	61.1	23	27.7	41	63.1	19	47.5
3. Makes no difference (N=439, 43%)	186	53.1	51	29.5	113	35.4	50	60.2	21	32.3	18	45.0
TOTAL (N=1030, 100%)	350	100.0	173	100.0	319	100.0	83	100.0	65	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE 24

PROVIDER EXPOSURE TO MASS MEDIA

Question #10	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Have you heard or read any information about day care home licensing/registration on the radio, in the newspaper, or from a pamphlet?												
Yes (N=563, 54%)	174	49.4	89	50.3	209	65.3	41	51.3	36	54.5	14	34.1
No (N=473, 46%)	178	50.6	88	49.7	111	34.7	39	48.8	30	45.5	27	65.9
TOTAL (N=1036, 100%	352	100.0	177	100.0	320	100.0	80	100.0	66	100.0	41	100.0

TABLE 25

PARENT'S EXPOSURE TO MASS MEDIA

Question #11	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Have any of your day care children's parents talked to you about any information on day care home licensing/registration that they heard or read about on the radio, in the newspaper, or from a pamphlet?												
No (N=915, 83%)	308	82.1	135	73.8	307	88.2	74	87.1	55	83.3	36	83.7
Yes (N=185, 17%)	67	17.9	48	26.2	41	11.8	11	12.9	11	16.7	7	16.3
TOTAL (N=1100, 100%)	375	100.0	183	100.0	348	100.0	85	100.0	66	100.0	43	100.0

TABL 26

'PARENTS' QUESTIONS

Question 11a	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N .	%	N	%
If children's parents did ask about information, did they ask?												
1. If you were licensed/ registered	54	65.9	33	56.9	37	68.5	8	61.5	7	63.6	6	66.7
2. If you meet the rules	14	17.1	10	17.2	8	14.8	3	23.1	3	27.3	1	11.1
3. Other	14	17.1	15	25.9	9	16.7	2	15.4	1	9.1	2	22.2
TOTAL	82	100.0	58	100.0	54	100.0	13	100.0	11	100.0	9	100.0

TABLE 27

MOST HELPFUL SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Question #12	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Which of the following sources of day care information have been helpful to you in providing family day care?												
1. Caregiver newsletter	207	43.8	113	49.3*	158	48.0*	38	32.5	37	52.9*	3	8.3
2. Radio annoucements	8	1.7	2	0.9	2	0.6	0	0	1	1.4	1	2.8
3. Packet of day care material from county DSS	218	46.1*	78	34.1	127	38.6	59	50.4*	26	37.1	26	72.2*
4. Day care library at county DSS	6	1.3	4	1.7	3	0.9	7	6.0	1	1.4	0	0
5. Day care pamphlets at drug stores, doctor offices,etc.	17	3.6	11	4.8	9	2.7	2	1.7	0	0	2	5.6
6. Other	17	3.6	21	9.2	30	9.1	11	9.4	5	7.1	4	11.1
TOTAL	473	100.0	229	100.0	329	100.0	117	100.0	70	100.0	36	100.0
7. None of the above	63		33		102		11		12		10	

*Most frequently reported responses.

TABLE 28

AVAILABILITY OF DSS COUNTY OFFICE

Question #13	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Are you aware that you can contact your county's day care registration/licensing worker regarding questions you have about day caring?												
Yes (N=1092, 96%)	374	95.4	186	96.9	337	93.6	87	100.0	65	95.6	43	97.7
No (N=51, 4%)	18	4.6	6	3.1	23	6.4	0	0	3	4.4	1	2.3
TOTAL (N=1143, 100%)	392	100.0	192	100.0	360	100.0	87	100.0	68	100.0	44	100.0

TABLE 29

DID YOU ASK WORKER QUESTIONS?

Question #14	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did you ever ask the worker for help in answering day care questions?												
Yes (N=569, 52%)	166	44.1	105	56.1	179	52.2	46	52.9	40	60.6	33	75.0
No (N=534, 48%)	210	55.9	82	43.9	164	47.8	41	47.1	26	39.4	11	25.0
TOTAL (N=1103, 100%	376	100.0	187	100.0	343	100.0	87	100.0	66	100.0	44	100.0

Project Staff

State Office

Jeralyn Harrold Lowe, Project Manager, Division of Family Home Licensing
Jacqueline Wood, Project Assistant, Division of Family Home Licensing
Reginald K. Carter, Ph.D. Research, Social Services Evaluation and Program Analysis

Kalamazoo County (Registration)

Bruce Cleveland, Supervisor
Marge Hannapel
Linda Whitfield (3-75 to 1-76)
Sue Carpenter

Washtenaw County (Enriched Licensing)

Carla Lambarth, Supervisor
Wilma Krause
Shirley Moredyk (7-74 to 1-76)
Sandy Settergren (2-76 to 1-77)

Midland County (Registration)

Mary Huntley, Supervisor
Carol Randle (3-75 to 10-76)
Kathy Gravis
Carol List (10-76 to 1-77)

Marquette County (Enriched Licensing)

Angela Gingrass, Supervisor
Tom Dunleavy

Ingham County (Licensing)

Roselyn Chaffin, Supervisor
Janet Forslin (3-75 to 2-76)
Andi Brendle
Jil Gahsman
Brian Baumgart (3-76 to 1-77)
Pat VanDyke (3-76 to 1-77)

Shiawassee County (Licensing)

Mary Whitfield, Supervisor
Dianne Morales
Cathy Paradise (1-76 to 7-76)

the caregiver

Michigan Department of Social Services
August/September 1976

PLAY ACTIVITIES AND EQUIPMENT

Foods offer children numerous learning experiences. A toddler can learn how foods taste, feel, smell and sound by handling & eating raw or cooked foods. A schoolage child can learn math & science by measuring ingredients or observing the effects of cooking & freezing on food. An example would be how does a carrot, pea, cookie dough, or apple feel & taste when raw as compared to cooked.

Summer is a time when many fruits and vegetables are readily available at a lower price. Take advantage of the opportunity & explore foods with the children.

1. Pick and husk corn for lunch.
2. Hull peas for lunch.
3. Make fruit salad.
4. Make strawberry shortcake with the children cleaning & hulling the berries, plus stirring and measuring ingredients for biscuits.
5. Make blueberry pancakes - allow children to measure, stir & turn pancakes.
6. Make jello with fruits & vegetables added that the children have prepared.
7. Have the children make applesauce.
8. Clean raw radishes, celery, cauliflower and carrots for snacks.
9. Make homemade ice cream.

These are only 9 ideas; how many more can you think of?

Toddlers to schoolage children can help in some aspect of preparing any of the 9 ideas. Your judgment is the best guide to follow when giving a young child a task. You know what he can & can't do. Here are some additional tips on setting up a food activity.

1. Wash hands first.
2. Allow the children to taste as they work.
3. Have 2-3 children working at the same time to shorten "waiting" time - ex. everyone husking corn instead of one child.
4. Use dull knives without sharp points.

Have all your ingredients & equipment ready before you start.

6. Work at a height which is easy for the children.
7. Electric frypans work better than a stove if the children are stirring or turning a cooking food. Remember - be super careful with heat sources.

Good Cooking !

HINTS FOR WORKING WITH CHILDREN

Make mealtimes & snack times enjoyable by building good food habits! As a caregiver, you play a very important role in helping a child develop food habits which serve as a foundation for good health.

These hints may assist you in that role.

1. Remember, children need to eat more often than adults.
2. Give small food servings with a chance for seconds.
3. Serve foods in small bite-size pieces (the smaller the child, the smaller the pieces.)
4. Serve food lukewarm instead of hot or col
5. Introduce one new food at a time.
6. Remember, a child's appetite will vary from day to day.
7. Call children to eat when the food is ready, avoid waiting.
8. Serve meals at a regularly scheduled tim
9. Occasional spills should be expected as children learn to better coordinate their muscles.
10. Encourage the children to help you get the meals and snacks ready.

Finally, one last idea, which can sometimes make a meal fun, is using your imagination to pretend you are eating by the "ocean", on a "boat", in a "train", or at the "zoo". Ask the children where they would like to eat in the "world" or would they like to eat with a storybook character. As they eat, talk about all of the wonderful things you see, smell and hear beside the "zebra's" cage". Encouraging a child to use his imagination also helps the child learn the skills he will need in problem solving late

TABLE 30

HOW HELPFUL WERE ANSWERS?

Question #14b	Big Counties						Small Counties					
	Registration (Kalamazoo)		Enr. Licensing (Washtenaw)		Reg. Licensing (Ingham)		Registration (Midland)		Enr. Licensing (Marquette)		Reg. Licensing (Shiawassee)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
If you ever asked your worker for information, was it helpful?												
Yes (N=512)	152	94.4	92	89.3	155	91.2	43	95.6	39	97.5	31	96.9
No (N=39)	9	5.6	11	10.7	15	8.8	2	4.4	1	2.5	1	3.1
TOTAL (N=551)	161	100.0	103	100.0	170	100.0	45	100.0	40	100.0	32	100.0

DEAR CAREGIVER

Dear Aneka,
You asked how to handle your husband blowing up over a messy house. Mrs. C. Suscha of Ypsilanti has 3 suggestions.
1. "Draw your husband into the group by explaining that this is your job - it brings in money & helps out the family budget. Ask for his help & advice on things like inexpensive lunches & handling a problem child.
2. Ask him to build a box or pick up a heavy cardboard box for the toys. Cover or paint it white & have the kids draw pictures on it. Finally, 20 min. before your husband comes, make a game out of picking up the toys. Then have the kids sit down with a book or watch TV quietly until "Daddy" arrives.
3. Section off 1 room for active play & another for quiet play (watching TV, coloring or puzzles). That way, one room only is a "Big Mess".

Dear Julie,
L. Adams of Holt wrote this regarding your 7 year old fighting with day care children. "When my son fought, I got really upset. Then I realized he needed me as much as my day care children, even though he was older. These actions sure helped me:
1. Greet her warmly every time she comes home from school. Spend a few minutes talking about what she wants to talk about.
2. Tell her how proud you are of her when she helps a day care child.
3. Ignore some of the things she does for attention, that you wish she wouldn't do.
4. Give her a hug when she does something well."

****

Here's the next question we need ideas on:

Dear Caregiver:
I'm caring for a three-year-old who repeatedly takes things: a necklace from a child, candy bars from the grocery, etc. I've tried to explain that he shouldn't do this. I'm not his mother & have a problem with her about discipline. I'm rather new at this & need a solution. Fay, Saginaw

Please send your answers to Fay's question & any questions you may have to the Editor for next month.

INFORMATION!!
Ever had a child catch pink eye, impetigo, the fifth disease, head lice, chicken pox, scarlet fever or strep throat? Call your local health department! If you are caring for a child who becomes ill or catches something & you want information, the public health nurse at your County Health Department can be a great help! She can tell you how long the illness lasts, when other children can catch it, how it spreads, what the symptons are, how long it takes for symptoms to show up, how to check for the symptoms & any special precautions to take as a Caregiver.
Give her a call at:
Kalamazoo - #383-8869, Midland - #835-7781
Marquette - #475-9977, Washtenaw - #973-1460
- and ask for the "Public Health Nurse".

Published bimonthly by:
Family Home Licensing Unit
Department of Social Services
300 S. Capitol Avenue
Lansing, Michigan 48926
Jacqueline Wood, Editor
Send any correspondence and ideas to the Editor at the above address.

APPENDIX C Pamphlet Insert

PROCEDURE FOR BECOMING REGISTERED AS A FAMILY DAY CARE HOME IN KALAMAZOO COUNTY

1) Call us between 8am and 5pm weekdays at 382-2870 and ask for Day Care Registration. Ask the registration worker to send you the information packet on Family Day Care Registration.

2) When you receive the packet, read it over carefully. Then obtain three signatures from personal references on the forms provided.

3) Bring these three signed reference forms into the Day Care Registration Office. Please call ahead to make sure the registration worker will be there.

4) At the office you will be asked to complete a Statement of Registration verifying that you intend to comply with State Act 116 and the Family Day Care Rules throughout the period of your registration.

5) After registering, you'll receive a packet of child care information, and you may also check out books and pamphlets from our day care library. At this time we are also available for consultation.

6) Before you leave the office, the worker will explain that you need to return a medical statement signed by a doctor, as well as TB tests for everyone over 14 years of age living in your home.

7) Within several weeks you will receive a Certificate of Registration.

Any questions? Please call us:

KALAMAZOO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIAL SERVICES
Family Day Care Registration

382-2870

SELECTING A FAMILY DAY CARE HOME

The choice you make in terms of child care is tremendously important. The family day care home you choose plays a critical role in your child's development. Your choice can determine how smoothly your days will start. It becomes an important factor in how comfortable you are in leaving your child each day. It is the key to how your child will enjoy his day.

Take time in selecting your child's family day care home! It is an important decision. Visit several homes before you decide. A home which is great for one child may not be right for your child. Here are some ways to get started in your selection.

1. SELECT A HOME FROM THE LICENSED/REGISTERED FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES IN YOUR AREA. CALL THE DAY CARE UNIT AT YOUR COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES FOR THE NAMES OF HOMES IN YOUR AREA.

2. LOOK INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF EACH HOME WHERE YOUR CHILD WOULD BE PLAYING. TRY TO VISIT THE HOME WHEN OTHER CHILDREN ARE THERE SO YOU CAN SEE HOW THE CAREGIVER AND CHILDREN RELATE TO EACH OTHER.

3. TALK WITH AND OBSERVE THE CAREGIVER. ASK YOURSELF, DOES THE CAREGIVER:

a. seem to enjoy being with children?
b. appear open to questions & ideas?
c. show children warmth by smiling, laughing, cuddling, holding, & touching?
d. spend time playing, talking, reading, & pretending with the children?
e. handle discipline in a kind, fair, & consistent manner?
f. save visits with friends or watching TV until naptime or after the children are gone?
g. respect each child & his feelings?
h. watch children carefully in & out of doors?

4. DISCUSS WHAT YOUR CHILD WILL DO DURING THE DAY. WILL HE:

a. have a variety of toys & games to play with? Have activities to do like helping make snacks, looking at books, drawing, singing, climbing, etc.
b. have a quiet place he can be by himself?
c. go on walks to see interesting things in the neighborhood?
d. watch TV sparingly for only 1-2 special programs instead of all morning each day?

5. IF CHILDREN ARE PRESENT WHILE YOU ARE IN THE HOME, DO THEY:

a. look & act happy?
b. seem to like & trust the caregiver?
c. seem to enjoy what they are doing?
d. fight or cry alot? If so, why?

6. FINALLY ASK YOURSELF:

a. do you feel comfortable with the caregiver & the home?
b. can you visit the home during the day if you want?
c. would the caregiver take time to talk with you about the "important little things" your child does?
d. is the caregiver caring for only the number of children for which she is licensed/registered?

Remember Day Care is More Than Just Babysitting! Any other questions?

Please Call Us:

Family Day Care Registration/Licensing

APPENDIX D

Cost Information

Fill out the following information as best you can to help us determine the cost of registration and licensing in your county during the data months.

1. Transportation Costs: (Attach Travel Expense Report)

   a) Number of miles traveled during data month?

   ____________________ What % of these miles were for family day care home regulation? ______________

   b) What is the reimbursement rate for the above mileage? ___________

   c) How many licensing visits were covered under this mileage? _________

2. Public, Provider, and Consumer Infoemation Costs

   a) Briefly describe what occurred in your county during the data month relating to public information for family day care homes? Give the estimated time and cost involved per month.

   b) Briefly describe any family day care provider information that occurred during the month. Estimate cost and time.

   c) What occurred in your county for consumer information? Estimate cost and time for the month.

   d) (1) Did any of the above involve your time during evenings and weekends for which you worked overtime? Yes ____ No ____

   If yes, how much ____________________________________

   (2) List how many meetings or visits you were involved outside of "8 a.m.– 5 p.m.." this month.

   (3) Did you work any other evenings or weekends on Family Day Care Regulation?

County Name: ______________________

112

Month of: ________________________

Staffing Patterns for Family Day Care Home Regulation

Please review and answer the following as accurately as possible based on what is actually in existence on the 1st working day of a data month.

---

1. How many workers license/register family day care homes in your county?

2. What is the average caseload size for each family day care home regulatory worker?

Full-time licensing/registration worker: ____________________

Part-time licensing/registrationwworker: a) ____________________ (family day care homes)

b) ____________________ (other caseloads)

3. At what civil service level are the above regulatory workers. What % of time does each worker, at a specific level, contribute to family day care home regulation?

	Civil Service Level	% of time
Worker 1		
Worker 2		
Worker 3		
Worker 4		
Worker 5		

4. How many support staff persons (clerks and/or aides) do you allocate to family day care home regulation. (this does not include other day care services).

Clerks ____________

Aides ____________

5. At what civil service level are your clerks and/or aides who work with family day care home licensing/registration? What % of time does each clerk, at a specific level, contribute to regulation.

	Civil Service Level	% of time
Clerk 1		
Clerk 2		
Clerk 3		
Clerk 4		
Clerk 5		
Clerk 6		
Aide 1		
Aide 2		
Aide 3		

County Name: ____________________

Month of ____________________

Thanks a lot!

County ____________________

Media Pamphlet Distribution

Record the following information so that we will be able to assess the impact of the media package. List all places and amounts where you have distributed the pamphlets.

Month	Place-Where Pamphlets Were Displayed	Number Distributed

Sent to Jackie - at end of each data month.

NON-CONFORMITY TO RULES

1. Keep a tally of noncompliance, adverse action, withdrawal of applications, and returns of license/certificates you handle during the month. Use a slash [/] to tally totals and sub-headings.

2. After each sub-heading tally (e.g. Spot Check), list the rule violations by number which relate to a particular home. Be certain to use the full number of each rule to indicate whether the home was investigated under new or old rules.
Example: \-1302(b), 1305, 1312(2) or \-10, 15, 22.

NOTE: Some sub-headings relate to licensing only.
Example: The registration process does not include denial.

3. If you tally a home twice under the same sub-heading during the month, draw a circle around the second tally.

MONTH OF ______________________ COUNTY OF ______________________

I. TOTAL NUMBER OF HOMES FOUND IN NONCOMPLIANCE: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

Periodic Visit	Spot Check (Project)	Spot Check (Supervision)	Central File Check and Complaint Investigation
(rule violations by #)	(rule violations by #)	(rule violations by #)	(rule violations by #)
1. ____	1. ____	1. ____	1. ____
2. ____	2. ____	2. ____	2. ____
3. ____	3. ____	3. ____	3. ____
4. ____	4. ____	4. ____	4. ____

II. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADVERSE OR PROVISIONAL ACTIONS RECOMMENDED: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Denials	Revocation	Refusals to Renew	Provisionals (Noncom
1. ____	1. ____	1. ____	1. ____
2. ____	2. ____	2. ____	2. ____
3. ____	3. ____	3. ____	3. ____
4. ____	4. ____	4. ____	4. ____

III. TOTAL NUMBER OF HOMES YOU WOULD HAVE DENIED OR CLOSED IF THE LICENSE/APPLICATION HAD NOT B WITHDRAWN OR RETURNED VOLUNTARILY: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Voluntarily Withdrawal of Application	Voluntarily Return of Certificate/Lice
1. ____	1. ____
2. ____	2. ____
3. ____	3. ____
4. ____	4. ____
5. ____	5. ____

NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS

DIRECTIONS:

1. Keep a tally of all complaints you receive during the month. Use a slash [/] to cross off the numeral below listed under the appropriate heading: A - RULE-RELATED COMPLAINTS
   B - NON-RULE RELATED COMPLAINTS
   C - HOMES OPERATING ILLEGALLY
   (One slash (2) per complaint.)

2. After each tally under the headings A. - Rule-Related and C. - Homes Operating Illegally, list the alleged rule violations using the full rule number. (Example 7-1302(b), 1305 or 4-10, 15, 22) Complaints under heading A may relate to the old or the new rules depending on the set of rules under which the home is licensed. Heading C complaints will always pertain to new rules.

3. Some complaints tallied under headings A & C will require additional action after your initial contact with the provider. Any complaints requiring additional action are to be tallied with a slash under heading D.

MONTH OF: ______________________ COUNTY OF: ______________________

A. RULE-RELATED COMPLAINTS

(alleged rule violations by # marked after numeral)

______
______
______

2. ______
______
______

3. ______
______
______

4. ______
______
______

5. ______
______
______

6. ______
______
______

7. ______
______
______

8. ______
______
______

9. ______
______
______

10. ______
______
______

B. NON-RULE RELATED COMPLAINTS	C. HOMES OPERATING ILLEGALLY	
1	1	______
2	2	______
3	3	______
4	4	______
5	5	______
6	6	______
7	7	______
8	8	______
9	9	______
10	10	______
11	11	______
12	12	______
13	13	______
14	14	______

D. Mark the total # of Complaints Requiring Additional Action after an Initial Contact (e.g. follow-up letter, second home visit, etc.):

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

INQUIRIES ABOUT FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

DIRECTIONS: Keep this sheet handy from the first to the last working day of each data month - August, October, January, and April. Whenever you receive an inquiry about family day care homes, cross out one of the numerals listed below. Tally each inquiry only once, unless the inquiry concerns 2 areas. The tally is to show us the total number of inquiries you received over one month. *NOTE: If you refer an inquiry on, don't tally it on your sheet. The person who finally gives the caller the needed information and deals with any further action should tally the call.

Example: Licensure Inquiry

1. A call from a person asking how he could become licensed.
   CODED: LICENSURE/PROVIDER.
2. An inquiry from a parent/consumer who wants to know what the state requires of a licensed home. CODED: LICENSURE INQUIRY/CONSUMER.

Placement Inquiry

3. A call from a provider stating she has openings for children in her home.
   CODED: PLACEMENT INQUIRY/PROVIDER.
4. A call from a parent asking for the names of licensed homes in her area.
   CODED: PLACEMENT INQUIRY/CONSUMER.

*ASK EACH INQUIRER IF HE LEARNED ABOUT FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES FROM HEARING A RADIO ANNOUNCEMENT OR SEEING A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, If the inquirer states "Yes", place a ✓ next to the numeral which you just tallied. (Example: 5 ✓)

MONTH OF ____________________ COUNTY OF ____________________

LICENSURE INQUIRY						PLACEMENT INQUIRY					
(1) Provider			(2) Consumer			(3) Provider			(4) Consumer		
1__	31__	61__	1__	31__	61__	1__	31__	61__	1__	31__	61__
2__	32__	62__	2__	32__	62__	2__	32__	62__	2__	32__	62__
3__	33__	63__	3__	33__	63__	3__	33__	63__	3__	33__	63__
4__	34__	64__	4__	34__	64__	4__	34__	64__	4__	34__	64__
5__	35__	65__	5__	35__	65__	5__	35__	65__	5__	35__	65__
6__	36__	66__	6__	36__	66__	6__	36__	66__	6__	36__	66__
7__	37__	67__	7__	37__	67__	7__	37__	67__	7__	37__	67__
8__	38__	68__	8__	38__	68__	8__	38__	68__	8__	38__	68__
9__	39__	69__	9__	39__	69__	9__	39__	69__	9__	39__	69__
10__	40__	70__	10__	40__	70__	10__	40__	70__	10__	40__	70__
11__	41__	71__	11__	41__	71__	11__	41__	71__	11__	41__	71__
12__	42__	72__	12__	42__	72__	12__	42__	72__	12__	42__	72__
13__	43__	73__	13__	43__	73__	13__	43__	73__	13__	43__	73__
14__	44__	74__	14__	44__	74__	14__	44__	74__	14__	44__	74__
15__	45__	75__	15__	45__	75__	15__	45__	75__	15__	45__	75__
16__	46__	76__	16__	46__	76__	16__	46__	76__	16__	46__	76__
17__	47__	77__	17__	47__	77__	17__	47__	77__	17__	47__	77__
18__	48__	78__	18__	48__	78__	18__	48__	78__	18__	48__	78__
19__	49__	79__	19__	49__	79__	19__	49__	79__	19__	49__	79__
20__	50__	80__	20__	50__	80__	20__	50__	80__	20__	50__	80__
21__	51__	81__	21__	51__	81__	21__	51__	81__	21__	51__	81__
22__	52__	82__	22__	52__	82__	22__	52__	82__	22__	52__	82__
23__	53__	83__	23__	53__	83__	23__	53__	83__	23__	53__	83__
24__	54__	84__	24__	54__	84__	24__	54__	84__	24__	54__	84__
25__	55__	85__	25__	55__	85__	25__	55__	85__	25__	55__	85__
26__	56__	86__	26__	56__	86__	26__	56__	86__	26__	56__	86__
27__	57__	87__	27__	57__	87__	27__	57__	87__	27__	57__	87__
28__	58__	88__	28__	58__	88__	28__	58__	88__	28__	58__	88__
29__	59__	89__	29__	59__	89__	29__	59__	89__	29__	59__	89__
30__	60__	90__	30__	60__	90__	30__	60__	90__	30__	60__	90__

Project Compliance Record

Spot Check for Old Rules

Instructions: Answer each question with a (✓) in the "yes" or "no" box. If "no" is checked, the home must be marked in noncompliance with the rule or subrule. All rules not in compliance must be discussed with the licensee and the "Discuss" column is to be checked. Space for comments is provided at the bottom of each page.

. LICENSEE'S FULL NAME		2. PROVIDER NO.	3. PHONE NO.
. ADDRESS (Street Address, City, State, Zip Code)		5. COUNTY	6. NO. AND AGES LICENSED FOR
. WORKER'S NAME	8. DATE AND TIME OF VISIT	9. RULES IN NON-COMPLIANCE	

. OTHER MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD (Include the following information)

NAME	BIRTHDATE	RELATIONSHIP	HOURS HOME DURING DAY

Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Discuss
Rule 22. When infants and young children are in care. (a) Is each caregiver at least 18 years of age? ___Yes ___No (b) Is there someone at least 18 years of age, who is willing to help if an emergency occurred and the caregiver had to leave? _____Yes _____No Person's Name ______________________________ Age: _____			
Rule 17. Is the caregiver able to move and think appropriately, quickly, and soundly to handle emergencies? _____Yes _____No Does the caregiver know where to get emergency help? _____Yes _____No			
Rule 2. Is the home caring for no more than 2 children under the age of 12 months at any one time including related children? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 19. Is the total number of children under 17 years of age in the home 8 or less, including related children? ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Discuss
Rule 27. Does the daily routine promote good health, rest, and play habits by including: (a) Active play such as rolling, crawling, stretching, throwing, running, climbing, dancing, and being noisy? ____Yes ____No (b) Quiet play such as listening, reading, singing, drawing, painting, pretending, thinking, and playing alone with a toy? ____Yes ____No (c) Indoor and outdoor play as weather permits? ____Yes ____No (d) Sleep and/or rest? ____Yes ____No (e) Meals and/or snacks? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 31. Are varied, adequate, and wholesome meals/snacks served including sufficient quantities of: (a) Milk and milk products? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Meat and eggs? ____Yes ____No			
(c) Fruits and vegetables? ____Yes ____No			
(d) Whole grain cereals and breads? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 6. Is the home constructed, arranged, and maintained to adequately provide for the health and safety of occupants? ____Yes ____No Consider the following, in determining the above: (a) Rooms used by children well lighted and ventilated? ____Yes ____No (b) Porch, balcony, and stairway safe to protect children against falls (having handrails, steps in good repair, children's gates, or other sturdy barriers)? ____Yes ____No (c) Rooms used by children free from drafts and leaks? ____Yes ____No (d) Floors and wall kept clean? ____Yes ____No (e) Furnishings clean and safe? ____Yes ____No (f) Exits clear, easy to reach, and get out of? (Exits shall include doors, doorways, connecting hallways, stairways, operable windows, fire escapes, etc.) ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Discuss
Rule 9. (a) Do all rooms, used by children, have ceilings at least 5 feet above grade (ground) level? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Are all sleeping room windows easy to open (without tools), big enough and low enough for people to get out of quickly? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 14. Is the play space free from hazards by the following being out of reach of children: (a) Litter and rubbish? ____Yes ____No (b) Cleaning solutions, insecticides, and poisons? ____Yes ____No (c) Sharp objects (knives, etc.)? ____Yes ____No (d) Flammable materials (matches, gasoline)? ___Yes ___No (e) Bleaches and detergents? ____Yes ____No (f) Medical supplies? ____Yes ____No (g) Plastic bags? ____Yes ____No (h) Firearms? ____Yes ____No (i) Other similar materials such as mothballs, glues, etc.? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 15. Are medical statements in the licensing record for all members of the home over 12 years of age? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 34. Does the licensee keep a record of each child's name, age, and the date of his entry and discharge? ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Com	Non-Comp.	Dis cus
Rule 35. Is the following information recorded for each day care child: (a) Names of parents or relatives? ____Yes ____No			
(b) Address and telephone number of the parents or relatives? ____Yes ____No			
(c) Places and hours of employment of parents or relatives? ____Yes ____No			
(d) Instructions for reaching the parents or relatives? ____Yes ____No			
(e) Name, address and telephone number of another person who might be reached in case of emergency? ____Yes ____No			
(f) Name, address and telephone number of the family physician? ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Spot Check Summary (Use back if necessary) Note: Summary may include recommendation for furt follow-up action.

DATE: WORKER'S SIGNATURE

Project Compliance Record

Spot Check for New Rules

Instructions: Answer each question with a (✓) in the "yes" or "no" box. If "no" is **checked**, the home must be marked in noncompliance with the rule or subrule. All rules **not in** compliance must be discussed with the licensee and the "Discuss" column is to **be checked.** Space for comments is provided at the bottom of each page.

. LICENSEE'S FULL NAME	2. PROVIDER NO.	3. PHONE NO.
. ADDRESS (Street Address, City, State, Zip Code)	5. COUNTY	6. NO. AND AGES LICENSED FOR
. WORKER'S NAME 8. DATE AND TIME OF VISIT		9. RULES IN NON-COMPLIANCE

. OTHER MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD (Include the following information)

NAME	BIRTHDATE	RELATIONSHIP	HOURS HOME DURING DAY

Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Discuss
Rule 1302. (1) (a) Is each caregiver at least 18 years of age? Age: _____ ____Yes ____No			
(d) Is the caregiver able to move and think appropriately, quickly, and soundly to handle emergencies? ____Yes ____No			
(3) Is there someone at least 18 years of age, who is willing to help in an emergency? ____Yes ____No Person's Name ______________________ Age: ____ Does this person live close enough to respond quickly to an emergency? ____Yes ____No Is this person generally available during the times children are in care? ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks Only) | Comp. | Non-Comp. | Dis cus

Rule 1303.

Is the ratio of caregivers to children present in the home at any one time a 1:6 ratio? (Count all un-related children in care and any related children under the age of 7 years.)

____Yes ____No

(a) How many children are: Present_____
Related and under 7 years old______
Unrelated and in care_____
Under 12 months old_____

(b) How many caregivers are present giving direct care? ______

Is each caregiver caring for no more than 2 children under the age of 12 months at any one time? _____Yes _____No

Rule 1304.

(2) Is there a daily schedule set up considering each child and including:

(a) Active play such as rolling, crawling, stretching, throwing, running, climbing, dancing, and being noisy?

_____Yes _____No

Quiet play, such as listening, reading, singing, drawing, painting, pretending, thinking, and playing alone with a toy? ____Yes ____No

(b) Indoor and outdoor play as weather permits? ____Yes ____No

(c) Sleep and/or rest? ____Yes ____No

(d) Meals and/or snacks? ____Yes ____No

Rule 1306.

(1) Name the indoor and outdoor play equipment children can use.

Indoor: ____

____

____

Outdoor: ____

____

____

Is there enough play equipment that:

(a) Is suitable for the ages and interests of the children?

_____Yes ____No

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Discuss
(b) Offers a variety of things to climb on, look at, handle, listen to, take apart, explore, pretend with, etc.? ____Yes ____No			
(2) Is the equipment safe, clean, and sturdy? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 1307. (1) Does the licensee have a written food agreement worked out with each child's parent which includes when the child is to be fed, amounts of food to be served, and who provides the food? ____Yes ____No			
Are the meals/snacks nutritious, and well balanced in that they: (a) Include foods from each of the four basic food groups such as.... -- milk, cheeses, ice cream -- meat, eggs, dried beans, nuts -- dark green and yellow vegetables, fruits -- bread, cereal, rice, tortillas, grits? ____Yes ____No (b) Avoid high calorie, low nutrition foods such as pop, potato chips, kool aid, candy? ____Yes ____No			
e 1311. (1) Are the homes, its premises and furnishings clean and safe? ____Yes ____No Consider the following, in determining the above: (a) Rooms used by children well lighted and ventilated? ____Yes ____No (b) Porch, balcony, and stairway safe to protect children against falls (having handrails, steps in good repair, children's gates, or other sturdy barriers)? ___Yes ___No (c) Rooms used by children free from drafts and leaks? ____Yes ____No (d) Floors and wall kept clean? ____Yes ____No (e) Furnishings clean and safe? ____Yes ____No			
Rule 1312. (1) Where the children can play indoors, is there at least 35 sq. ft. of play area per child present in the home? (Bathrooms and storage areas can't be used in determining square footage.) ____Yes ____No			

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks Only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Dis cus

List the approximate size of rooms where children play:

Room ______ Size ______

______

______

______

______

______

______

______

Number of children present in home? ______

(This includes all children, related and unrelated, who are under 18 years of age).

Rule 1315.

(1) Does each floor, used by children, have 2 exits? (Exits shall include doors, doorways, connecting hallways, stairways, operable windows, fire escapes, etc.) ____Yes ____No

Does at least 1 exit from each floor level give a continuous and unobstructed way of travel to the outside at ground level?

_____Yes _____No

(2) If a window is used as an exit, is it easily opened (without tools), big enough and low enough for people to get out of quickly? ____Yes ____No

If the window has a screen, can it be removed from the inside?

____Yes ____No

Rule 1317.

Are each of the following out of reach of children:

(a) Cleaning solutions, insecticides, and poisons? ___Yes___No

(b) Sharp objects (knives, etc.)? ____Yes ____No

(c) Flammable materials (matches, gasoline,)? ____Yes ____No

(d) Bleaches and detergents? ____Yes ____No

(e) Medical supplies? ____Yes ____No

(f) Plastic bags? ____Yes ____No

(g) Firearms? ____Yes ____No

(h) Other similar materials such as mothballs, glues, etc.?

___Yes ___No

COMMENTS:

Key Compliance Areas (Spot Checks only)	Comp.	Non-Comp.	Dis-cus
Rule 1318. (1) (a) Does the licensee have signed and notarized parental permission for emergency medical care for each child? _____Yes ____No			
Rule 1319. (1) (a) Has the licensee provided the Department with a current signed physician's statement indicating that the caregiver is mentally and physically capable of handling the added responsibility of child care? ____Yes ____No Date of Statement: ____________________ (18-65 years old - statement every 2 years; over 65 years-statement every year)			
Rule 1320. (2) Does the licensee have for each child enrolled the following information?			
(a) Child's full name and birthdate? _____Yes ____No			
(b) Name of parent? _____Yes _____No			
(c) Home address and telephone number of parent? ____Yes____No			
(d) Parent's business telephone number? ____Yes ____No			
(e) Name, address, and telephone number of family physician and/or hospital desired in an emergency? _____Yes _____No			
(f) Name, address and telephone number of another person to notify in case of an emergency? _____Yes _____No			

COMMENTS:

Spot Check Summary (use back if necessary) Note: Summary may include Recommendation and Follow-up Action:

DATE:

WORKER'S SIGNATURE

APPENDIX E - PROVIDER QUESTIONNAIRE

STATE OF MICHIGAN

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, Governor
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
300 S. CAPITOL AVENUE, LANSING, MICHIGAN 48926
JOHN T. DEMPSEY, Director

October 15, 1976

To: Family Day Care Home Providers

Dear Provider:

You will find a short questionnaire on family day care and a return envelope enclosed with this letter. I am asking that you take a few minutes of your time to answer the 14 questions.

This questionnaire is part of a special 2-year project which the Department of Social Services has been conducting in your county. The project has been examining two methods of regulating family day care homes. One method is licensing and the second method is registration.

Now, your help is needed. Your answers to this questionnaire will give us information about how you feel about licensing or registration. Your answers on the questionnaire, with other information gathered over the past year, will become part of the Department's report to the Legislature on how to regulate family day care homes all over Michigan in the future.

Your answers to the questionnaire will be confidential and will not affect your license or certificate of registration.

Please take time to complete the questionnaire. Use the enclosed envelope to mail your responses to me within 2 weeks.

Thank you for your time and for sharing your thoughts about licensing or registration.

Sincerely,

Reg Carter

Reginald Carter, Director
Social Services Evaluation and Analysis Section

Enclosures

MICHIGAN
THE GREAT LAKE STATE

STATE OF MICHIGAN

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

300 S. CAPITOL AVENUE, LANSING, MICHIGAN 48926

JOHN T. DEMPSEY, Director

November 1, 1976

To: Family Day Care Home Providers

Dear Provider:

Several weeks ago you may have received a short questionnaire from the Michigan Department of Social Services. The questionnaire asked for your personal feelings on the licensing or registration of family day care homes.

If you have completed and returned the questionnaire to the Department of Social Services, please ignore this second request for assistance. If you have not had the time to return it, please take a few minutes of your time to answer the enclosed 14 questions.

This questionnaire is part of the special 2-year project which the Department of Social Services has been conducting in your county. The project has been examining two methods of regulating family day care homes. One method is licensing and the second method is registration.

Your help is very much needed. Your answers to this questionnaire will give us information about how you feel about licensing or registration. Answers on the questionnaire, with other information gathered over the past year, will become part of the Department's report to the Legislature on how to regulate family day care homes all over Michigan in the future.

Your answers will be confidential and will not affect your license or certificate of registration.

Please take time to complete the questionnaire. Use the enclosed envelope to mail your responses to me within 2 weeks.

Thank you for your time and for sharing your thoughts about licensing or registration.

Sincerely,

Reginald Carter

Reginald Carter, Director
Social Services Evaluation and Analysis Section
Department of Social Services

Enclosures

MICHIGAN
THE GREAT LAKE STATE

FAMILY DAY CARE HOME
PROVIDER QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions as best you can. Thank you.

1. What county do you live in? ______________________________

☐ Kalamazoo ☐ Ingham ☐ Marquette
☐ Washtenaw ☐ Midland ☐ Shiawassee

2. How many children are you licensed or registered to care for? ______________________________

3. How many of your children under 18 years of age, are living with you? ______________________

4. How many *day care* children do you usually care for during a *week*? ______________________

(a) How many of these day care children have their day care costs paid by parents? ____________

(b) How many of these day care children are related to you? ______________________________

(c) What are the ages of these day care children?

	Age		Age		Age
1st child	______	5th child	______	9th child	______
2nd child	______	6th child	______	10th child	______
3rd child	______	7th child	______	11th child	______
4th child	______	8th child	______	12th child	______

5. Do you feel the family day care rules help contribute to the good care of children?

☐ yes
☐ no (If no, which of the following comes closest to your feelings?)

- ☐ The rules are a lot of red tape.
- ☐ The rules are too strict.
- ☐ A provider will give good child care without rules.
- ☐ Rules don't relate to child care.
- ☐ The rules are too easy.
- ☐ Other, specify ____

____

____

DSS-130 (7-79)

OVER ⟶

Note: Que[illegible] to 9, relate to *licensing* or *registration*. In *licensing*, a worker visits your home before you recei[illegible]e. In *registration*, you sign a Statement of Registration, without the worker visiting your home [illegible]

Please an[illegible]se questions based on your experience with licensing and/or registration.

6. Are you currently [illegible]*d* or have you been *previously licensed?*

☐ No ☐ Yes [illegible]s, answer a, b, and c, checking one or more items).

(a) When you first knew you needed to be licensed, did you mostly feel:

☐ angry
☐ worried
☐ it is more important to be licensed
☐ pleased
☐ that it was a waste of time
☐ that caring for children must be important
☐ that it's none of the State's business
☐ glad that the State was interested in me and children
☐ not too much one way or the other
☐ other, specify ______________________

(b) Do you feel the licensing process (home visit, reference checks, etc.):

☐ was easy
☐ took too long
☐ was interesting
☐ was uncomfortable because a worker came into my home
☐ was handled well
☐ asked many unnecessary personal questions
☐ made me proud of the attention given to me and my care of children
☐ other, specify ______________________

(c) Do you feel the worker's study of you and your home, made any difference in how you meet the rules now? ☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Are you currently registered?

☐ No ☐ Yes (If yes, answer a, b, c, d, e)

(a) When you first knew you needed to be registered, did you mostly feel:

☐ angry
☐ worried
☐ it is more important to be registered
☐ pleased
☐ that it was a waste of time
☐ that caring for children must be important
☐ that it's none of the State's business
☐ glad that the State was interested in me and children
☐ not too much one way or the other
☐ other, specify ______________________

(b) Do you feel the registration process (county office visit, signing the Statement of Registration, random spot visits):

☐ was easy
☐ took too long
☐ was interesting
☐ was comfortable because a worker would probably not be coming into my home
☐ was handled well
☐ asked many unnecessary personal questions
☐ made me proud of the attention given to me and my care of children
☐ other, specify ______________________________

____

(c) Did you meet all the rules when you signed the Statement of Registration?

☐ Yes ☐ No

(d) Do you feel spot check visits are needed to make a registered home meet the rules?

☐ Yes ☐ No

(e) Do you think registration and signing the Statement of Registration helps protect children in a day care home?

☐ Yes ☐ No

8. Have you been visited by a worker for a spot check visit since you were last licensed/registered?

☐ No ☐ Yes (If yes, answer a, b, c)

(a) Before the visit, did you mostly feel:

☐ worried
☐ pleased
☐ angry
☐ confident you met the rules
☐ not bothered
☐ looking forward to the visit
☐ other, specify ______________________________

____

____

(b) After the visit did you mostly feel good about it? ☐ Yes ☐ No

(c) Do you think the *one* spot check means a home won't be checked again? ☐ Yes ☐ No

9. As a person giving family day care, which would you rather be:

☐ registered ☐ licensed ☐ makes no difference

10. Have you heard or read any information about day care home licensing/registration on the radio, in the newspaper, or from a pamphlet?

☐ No ☐ Yes (If yes, answer a.)

(a) After hearing or reading the information, did it cause you to:

☐ contact the county department to apply for a license or to register
☐ seek for more day care information
☐ do nothing
☐ other, specify ______________________________

OVER →

11. Have any of your day care children's parents talked to you about any information on day care home licensing/registration that they heard or read about on the radio, in the newspaper, or from a pamphlet?

☐ No
☐ Yes (If yes, did the parents ask:)
  ☐ if you were licensed or registered?
  ☐ if you meet the rules?
  ☐ other, specify ____

12. Which of the following sources of day care information have been helpful to you in providing family day care?

☐ *The Caregiver* newsletter
☐ radio announcements
☐ packet of day care materials from your County Department
☐ day care library at your County Department
☐ Day care pamphlets at drug stores, doctor offices, community centers
☐ other, specify ____
☐ none of the above

13. Are you aware that you can contact your county's day care registration/licensing worker regarding questions you have about day caring?

☐ Yes ☐ No

14. Did you ever ask the worker for help in answering day care questions?

☐ No ☐ Yes (If yes, was the information helpful?) ☐ Yes ☐ No

Thank you for your help

Please enclose this questionnaire in the attached self-addressed envelope and send to the following address:

Reginald Carter, Policy Analyst
Department of Social Services
Social Services Evaluation & Analysis Section
10th Floor Commerce Center Building
300 S. Capitol
Lansing, Michigan 48926

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Class, Norris, "Public Policy and Working Mothers: A Historical Analysis of the American Experience", *Annual Lecture on Policy Issues*, Unpublished Paper given at the School of *Social Work*, University of Southern California, 1972.

Costain, Lela B., Child Welfare: Policies and Practice, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Morgan, Gwen, *Alternatives for Regulation of Family Day Care Homes for Children*.

Public Acts for Michigan Sessions of 1899, 1913, 1919 and 1944, Lansing, Michigan.